
Targeted Data Fusion for Causal Survival Analysis Under Distribution Shift

Yi Liu^{1,2} Alexander W. Levis³ Ke Zhu^{1,4} Shu Yang¹ Peter B. Gilbert⁵ Larry Han⁶

Abstract

Causal inference across multiple data sources has the potential to improve the generalizability, transportability, and replicability of scientific findings. However, data integration methods for time-to-event outcomes—common in medical contexts such as clinical trials—remain underdeveloped. Existing data fusion methods focus on binary or continuous outcomes, neglecting the distinct challenges of survival analysis, including right-censoring and the unification of discrete and continuous time frameworks. To address these gaps, we propose two novel approaches for multi-source causal survival analysis. First, considering a target site-specific causal effect, we introduce a semiparametric efficient estimator for scenarios where data-sharing is feasible. Second, we develop a federated learning framework tailored to privacy-constrained environments. This framework dynamically adjusts source site-specific contributions, downweighting biased sources and upweighting less biased ones relative to the target population. Both approaches incorporate non-parametric machine learning models to enhance robustness and efficiency, with theoretical guarantees applicable to both continuous and discrete time-to-event outcomes. We demonstrate the practical utility of our methods through extensive simulations and an application to two randomized trials of a monoclonal neutralizing antibody for HIV-1 prevention: HVTN 704/HPTN 085 (cis-gender men and transgender persons in the Americas and Switzerland) and HVTN 703/HPTN 081 (women in sub-Saharan Africa). The results high-

light the potential of our approaches to efficiently estimate causal effects while addressing heterogeneity across data sources and adhering to privacy and robustness constraints.

1. Introduction

Data integration promises to improve the generalizability, transportability, and replicability of scientific findings. However, leveraging data from multiple sources is challenging because of heterogeneous data structures, covariate shifts, differing treatment assignment mechanisms, and conditional outcome distribution shifts. Furthermore, privacy regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) in the United States, often preclude pooling individual-level data. These considerations create substantial barriers to drawing valid causal inferences, underscoring the need for robust methodologies that can accommodate multi-source data integration without violating privacy regulations.

Although recent years have witnessed rapid growth in data integration methods for causal inference (Han et al., 2021, 2024; Yang & Ding, 2019; Liu et al.; Han et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023), comprehensive reviews emphasize that most techniques have focused on binary or continuous outcomes (Colnet et al., 2024; Brantner et al., 2023; Degtiar & Rose, 2023). When time-to-event outcomes are considered, strong assumptions such as the Cox proportional hazards model (Hernán, 2010; Han, 2023) or the common conditional outcome distribution (CCOD) across sites (Lee et al., 2022; Cao et al., 2024) are often imposed. Importantly, violating the proportional hazards assumption or mis-specifying the outcome model can lead to bias. In addition, strict exchangeability assumptions may be untenable in practice if there are unknown shifts across sites in covariates and outcome-generating mechanisms. Recently, Westling et al. (2023) integrated double/debiased machine learning (Chernozhukov et al., 2018) with semiparametric survival curve estimation, enabling flexible nonparametric models (Wolock et al., 2024; Cui et al., 2023; van der Laan et al., 2007) for nuisance function estimation. However, this method was developed in the context of a single study, and it is not obvious how one could extend the method to multi-source contexts,

¹North Carolina State University, Department of Statistics, Raleigh, NC, USA ²Duke Clinical Research Institute, Durham, NC, USA ³Carnegie Mellon University, Department of Statistics, Pittsburgh, PA, USA ⁴Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA ⁵Vaccine and Infectious Disease and Public Health Sciences Divisions, Fred Hutch Cancer Center, Seattle, WA, USA ⁶Northeastern University, Department of Public Health and Health Sciences, Boston, MA, USA. Correspondence to: Larry Han <lar.han@northeastern.edu>.

especially with potential privacy constraints.

To address these gaps, we propose two methodological innovations for multi-source causal survival analysis. First, under settings where data sharing is feasible, we develop a semiparametric efficient estimator (Section 2.2) that adjusts for covariate shifts while ensuring both consistency and improved efficiency. Second, in more restrictive scenarios with potential CCOD violations and limited data sharing—necessitated by policies such as GDPR and HIPAA—we introduce a federated learning framework (Section 2.3). The latter uses a data-adaptive weighting strategy, upweighting less-biased sources and downweighting sources prone to bias, without requiring pooling of individual-level data.

Our federated approach distinguishes itself from existing methods in three key ways: (i) accommodating CCOD violations and covariate shifts, even when differences among sites are unknown a priori; (ii) avoiding reliance on strong parametric or semiparametric models by using flexible machine learning for nuisance estimation while maintaining parametric convergence rates; and (iii) accommodating events in both continuous and discrete time.

2. Multi-Source Inference on Treatment-specific Survival Functions

2.1. Notation, estimand, and assumptions

Consider K studies, each of which could be randomized or observational. For each participant in a given study, we observe a covariate vector \mathbf{X} representing baseline characteristics, and a binary treatment variable $A \in \{0, 1\}$, where 0 denotes control and 1 denotes the active treatment. Under the Neyman-Rubin potential outcomes framework (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974), we assume each participant has two potential event times, $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(0)}$, and two potential censoring times, $C^{(1)}$ and $C^{(0)}$, under treatments $A = 1$ and $A = 0$, respectively. However, we can only observe either $T = T^{(A)} = AT^{(1)} + (1 - A)T^{(0)}$ or $C = C^{(A)} = AC^{(1)} + (1 - A)C^{(0)}$ for each participant, assuming the stable-unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983). We also observe a right-censored outcome $Y = \min(T, C)$ together with an event indicator $\Delta = \mathbb{I}(T \leq C)$, where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. We denote an arbitrary observation as \mathcal{O} and the observed data of sample size n from all study sites as $\{\mathcal{O}_i = (\mathbf{X}_i, A_i, Y_i, \Delta_i, R_i), i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where R is a site variable taking values in $\{0, 1, \dots, K - 1\}$, with 0 representing the target site and the remaining $K - 1$ values representing source sites, $K > 1$.

In this paper, we are interested in the target-site treatment-specific survival function, denoted by $\theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{P}(T^{(a)} > t \mid R = 0)$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$ for some positive $\tau < \infty$. Here, the upper subscript 0 of $\theta^0(t, a)$ indicates the

target site $R = 0$, and \mathbb{P} means the probability distribution of an ideal data unit.

Furthermore, we consider the conditional survival function of the event time of site k , denoted by $S^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(T > t \mid A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k)$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$. We introduce the following Riemann-Stieltjes product integral notation $\prod_{(0,t]}$ (Gill & Johansen, 1990), a tool for unifying continuous and discrete times:

$$S^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{(0,t]} \{1 - \Lambda^k(du \mid a, \mathbf{x})\},$$

where

$$\Lambda^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t \frac{N_1^k(du \mid a, \mathbf{x})}{D^k(u \mid a, \mathbf{x})}$$

is the conditional cumulative hazard function under $R = k$, with $N_\delta^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq t, \Delta = \delta \mid A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k)$ the conditional cumulative incidence function of event ($\delta = 1$) or censoring ($\delta = 0$), and $D^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(Y \geq t \mid A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k)$. Notice that S^k and Λ^k have a one-to-one mapping, so by estimating Λ^k , we can obtain S^k , and vice versa. The product integral reduces to the normal product \prod under discrete time and $\exp\{-\Lambda^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x})\}$ under continuous time.

Throughout, we make the following four assumptions.

Assumption 2.1 (Unconfoundedness). $A \perp\!\!\!\perp T^{(a)} \mid \mathbf{X}, R$ and $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C^{(a)} \mid \mathbf{X}, R$.

Assumption 2.2 (Treatment-specific independent censoring). $C^{(a)} \perp\!\!\!\perp T^{(a)} \mid A = a, \mathbf{X}, R$.

Assumption 2.3 (Positive proportions for sites). There exists $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(R = k) \geq 1/\eta$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$.

Assumption 2.4 (Positivity of nuisance functions). There exists an $\eta \in (0, \infty)$, such that for \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} , $\min_{k=0}^{K-1} \{\pi^k(a \mid \mathbf{x}), G^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x})\} \geq 1/\eta$ and $\min_k S^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) > 0$. Here, $\pi^k(a \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(A = a \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k)$ is the propensity score of the treatment $A = a$ and $G^k(t \mid a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(C > t \mid A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k)$ is the conditional survival function of the censoring time in site k , for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$, $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$.

Assumption 2.3 ensures that the sampling or survey process prevents any site from contributing only an extremely small proportion of participants to the entire sample (Lee et al., 2022; Cao et al., 2024).

Under the above assumptions, the target estimand can be identified as

$$\theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{E}\{S^0(t \mid a, \mathbf{X}) \mid R = 0\},$$

for $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$. Suppose we only use data from the target site ($R = 0$), the efficient influence function (EIF) of $\theta^0(t, a)$ can be derived in Proposition 2.5.

Proposition 2.5 (Westling et al. (2023)). *The semiparametric EIF for $\theta^0(t, a)$ given $t \in [0, \tau]$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$ is $\varphi_{t,a}^{*0}(\mathcal{O}; S^0, G^0, \pi^0) = \varphi_{t,a}^{*0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) = \varphi_{t,a}^0(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) - \theta^0(t, a)$, where $\varphi_{t,a}^0(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) =$*

$$\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \left[1 - \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\pi^0(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \delta = 1)}{S^0(Y | a, \mathbf{X})G^0(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^0(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^0(u | a, \mathbf{X})G^0(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \right] S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}).$$

Throughout, let $\mathbb{P}_n[f(\mathcal{O})] = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathcal{O}_i)$ be the shorthand of the empirical average and $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ denote that the nuisance functions are replaced by their estimates. The above EIF motivates a doubly robust estimator, given as $\mathbb{P}_n[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^0(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}})]$. Under regularity conditions, this estimator is regular and asymptotic linear (RAL) and achieves the semiparametric variance lower bound uniformly over $t \in [0, \tau]$.

However, this result is based on a data structure that includes only the target site. To further improve efficiency by leveraging source data from the other $K - 1$ sites, we present two approaches over the next two sections.

2.2. Efficient estimation under CCOD and data sharing

When target and source sites are deemed to be sufficiently similar, it may be reasonable to assume that they have the same conditional outcome distribution, as formalized in the structural assumption below.

Assumption 2.6 (Common conditional outcome distribution). $T^{(a)} \perp\!\!\!\perp R | \mathbf{X}$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$.

Assumption 2.6 implies that the conditional survival function $S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X})$ has the same form across sites. It also imposes no restrictions on the covariate distribution across sites, allowing for any level of covariate shift. Under Assumption 2.6, data from non-target source sites can be leveraged to improve estimation efficiency. We first provide a result under CCOD that generalizes Proposition 2.5.

Consider additional nuisance functions (each defined without conditioning on R): the propensity score $\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(A = a | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$, the global conditional survival function for the event time $\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(T > t | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$, the global conditional survival function for the censoring time $\bar{G}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(C > t | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$, and the target site propensity $q^0(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{P}(R = 0 | \mathbf{X})$. Similar to Assumption 2.4, we impose the following positivity assumptions for these nuisance functions.

Assumption 2.7 (Positivity of global nuisance functions). There exists an $\eta \in (0, \infty)$, such that for \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} , $\min\{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{x}), \bar{G}(t | a, \mathbf{x})\} \geq 1/\eta$ and $\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) > 0$, for all $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$.

Theorem 2.8. *Under Assumption 2.6, the semiparametric EIF of $\theta^0(t, a)$ given $t \in [0, \tau]$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$ is*

$$\varphi_{t,a}^{*CCOD}(\mathcal{O}; \bar{S}, \bar{G}, \bar{\pi}) = \varphi_{t,a}^{*CCOD}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) = \varphi_{t,a}^{CCOD}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) - \theta^0(t, a), \text{ where } \varphi_{t,a}^{CCOD}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) =$$

$$\left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} - \frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{\bar{S}(Y | a, \mathbf{X})\bar{G}(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{X})\bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \right] \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}).$$

Given this EIF, we propose a semiparametrically efficient ‘‘CCOD estimator.’’

$$\widehat{\theta}_n^{CCOD}(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{CCOD}(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}})].$$

Moreover, we employ M -fold cross-fitting in line with the double/debiased machine learning (DML) framework (Chernozhukov et al., 2018). We allow a number of parametric and machine learning models (or an ensemble of these) from `survSuperLearner` (Westling et al., 2023) and `SuperLearner` (van der Laan et al., 2007) packages for nuisance function estimation.

In Theorem 2.9 below, we demonstrate the (uniform) RAL property of the proposed CCOD estimator. In the following, the subscript ‘‘ m ’’ denotes the prediction from the m -th validation set over the total sample of size n , where the n is omitted from the subscription.

Condition 2.1. *There exists $\bar{\pi}_\infty, \bar{G}_\infty, \bar{\Lambda}_\infty$ and \bar{S}_∞^k such that*

$$(a) \max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\widehat{\bar{\pi}}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{\bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X})} \right|^2 \right] \rightarrow_p 0;$$

$$(b) \max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \widehat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X}) - q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X}) \right|^2 \right] \rightarrow_p 0;$$

$$(c) \max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{\bar{G}}_m(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{\bar{G}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right|^2 \right] \rightarrow_p 0;$$

$$(d) \max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{\widehat{\bar{S}}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{\bar{S}}_m(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{\bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right|^2 \right] \rightarrow_p 0.$$

Condition 2.2. *There exists an $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ such that for \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} , $\widehat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $\bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $\widehat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $q_\infty^0(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $\widehat{\bar{G}}_m(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, and $\bar{G}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$ with probability tending to 1.*

Condition 2.3.

$$\max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \sup_{v \in [0, u]} \left| \frac{\widehat{\bar{S}}_m(u | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{\bar{S}}_m(v | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{\bar{S}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(v | a, \mathbf{X})} \right|^2 \right] \rightarrow_p 0.$$

Condition 2.4. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{r}_{n,t,a,1} &= \max_m \mathbb{P} \left| \{\widehat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X}) - \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})\} \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \{\widehat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X})\} \right|, \\ \bar{r}_{n,t,a,2} &= \max_m \mathbb{P} \left| \{\widehat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X}) - q^0(\mathbf{X})\} \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \{\widehat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X})\} \right|, \\ \bar{r}_{n,t,a,3} &= \max_m \mathbb{P} \left| \widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{G}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left(\frac{S^k}{\widehat{S}_m^k} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right|.\end{aligned}$$

Then, it holds that all $\bar{r}_{n,t,a,1} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, $\bar{r}_{n,t,a,2} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and $\bar{r}_{n,t,a,3} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Condition 2.5. It holds that all $\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \bar{r}_{n,u,a,1} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, $\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \bar{r}_{n,u,a,2} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, and $\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \bar{r}_{n,u,a,3} = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Theorem 2.9 (RAL of the CCOD estimator). *If Conditions 2.1–2.2 hold with $\bar{\pi}_\infty = \bar{\pi}$, $q_\infty^0 = q^0$, $\widehat{G}_\infty = \bar{G}$ and $\widehat{S}_\infty = \bar{S}$, and Condition 2.4 also holds, then $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a) = \theta^0(t, a) + \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. In particular, $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a))$ converges in distribution to a normal random variable with mean zero and variance $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{P}[(\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}})^2]$. If Conditions 2.3 and 2.5 also hold, then*

$$\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \left| \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(u, a) - \theta^0(u, a) - \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

In particular, $\{\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(u, a) - \theta^0(u, a) : u \in [0, t]\}$ converges weakly as a process in the space $\ell^\infty([0, t])$ of uniformly bounded functions on $[0, t]$ to a tight mean zero Gaussian process with covariance function $(u, v) \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\varphi_{u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} \varphi_{v,a}^{\text{CCOD}})$.

2.3. Federated estimation under heterogeneous outcome distributions across sites

In practice, it will often be unreasonable to assume CCOD, and sharing data might not be permitted under certain privacy constraints. When the CCOD assumption is violated, some source sites may provide relevant information for constructing the target-site survival estimate, while some may not. In this section, we present a methodology that combines information from target and source sites in a data-adaptive, privacy-preserving manner. In particular, the approach involves only minimal data sharing of summary statistics across sites.

2.3.1. LOCAL SITES

We first construct robust site-specific survival curve estimates using data from site $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$, making a working partial CCOD assumption that outcomes have the

same conditional distribution in site k as in the target site when $k \neq 0$. Note that we use this working partial CCOD assumption only to derive the form of the EIF, serving as the first step of our algorithm; to aggregate information from source sites, we derive federated weights to account for possible violations of CCOD in Section 2.3.2. An EIF under this assumption is derived in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.10. *For a given $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$, if there exists an $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\min\{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{x}), G^k(t | a, \mathbf{x})\} \geq 1/\eta$, $\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \eta$, and $S^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) > 0$ for \mathbb{P} -almost every \mathbf{x} , then $\theta^0(t, a)$ is a pathwise differentiable parameter given $t \in [0, \tau]$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$, in a nonparametric model with semiparametric EIF $\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}(\mathcal{O}; S^k, S^0, G^k, \pi^k, \omega^{k,0}) = \varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) = \varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) - \theta^0(t, a)$, where $\varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) =$*

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \\ & \times \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{S^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} | R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} | R=k)}$ is a density ratio function of covariates \mathbf{X} under target site to source site k .

A site-specific estimator can be motivated from the EIF above, namely $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n[\widehat{\varphi}^{k,0} t, a(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}})]$. Of note regarding $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a)$: (i) the ‘‘anchor’’ term in the EIF uses target-site data ($\mathbb{I}(R=0)$), while the ‘‘augmentation’’ term leverages site- k data ($\mathbb{I}(R=k)$); (ii) all information is obtained independently from each site except for the density ratio $\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X})$, which is estimated by sharing only coarse summary statistics under flexible models (Han et al., 2021), thereby adhering to data sharing constraints; and (iii) for S^k in the augmentation term, we train an S^0 model on the target site and apply its predictions to site k , since S^0 and S^k are exchangeable under partial CCOD. Crucially, if partial CCOD is violated, we can detect site heterogeneity by the difference between $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a)$ and $\widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a)$.

Furthermore, we use $\varphi_{t,a}^{*k}$ and $\varphi_{t,a}^k$ to denote the centered and uncentered EIFs for targeting $\theta^k(t, a)$ (the survival of site k). These follow the form in Proposition 2.5, with the site $R=0$ replaced by $R=k$. In the case where $k=0$, $\varphi_{t,a}^{*0,0} = \varphi_{t,a}^{*0}$ and $\varphi_{t,a}^{0,0} = \varphi_{t,a}^0$. The estimator $\widehat{\theta}^k(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{t,a}^k(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}})]$ serves as an ‘‘unadjusted’’ estimator for $\theta^0(t, a)$, lacking robustness when $k \neq 0$. In comparison, with the anchor term adjusted using target site data, $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a)$ preserves robustness for targeting $\theta^0(t, a)$.

Remark 2.11. To ensure the monotonicity of the estimated site-specific survival curves, we invoke isotonic regression techniques (Westling et al., 2020), which enforce a non-

increasing constraint on the survival estimates, thereby maintaining their logical consistency over time.

2.3.2. AGGREGATION ACROSS SITES

To aggregate information from the target and source sites, for a fixed time t and treatment a , we use an L_1 -penalization procedure to calculate federated weights for each site. We define $\widehat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^{k,0} = \widehat{\theta}^{k,0}(t, a) - \widehat{\theta}^k(t, a)$, and write $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a} = (\eta_{t,a}^0, \eta_{t,a}^1, \dots, \eta_{t,a}^{K-1})$ for the vector of federated weights. We estimate $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}$ data-adaptively by minimizing the following L_1 -penalized objective function:

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}) = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\left\{ \widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*0}(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}}) - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \eta_{t,a}^k \widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}}) \right\}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{n} \lambda \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} |\eta_{t,a}^k| (\widehat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^{k,0})^2, \quad (1)$$

subject to $0 \leq \eta_{t,a}^k \leq 1$, where $\widehat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^{k,0} = \widehat{\theta}^{k,0}(t, a) - \widehat{\theta}^k(t, a)$, for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_{t,a}^k = 1$, and λ is a tuning parameter that controls the bias-variance trade-off and is chosen by cross-validation.

The objective function follows the principle that one should ascribe higher (resp. lower) weight to the more (resp. less) informative sites. Heuristically, our approach anchors on the nonparametric estimate $\widehat{\theta}^0(t, a)$ and weights site k when it is deemed similar enough to the target site. Then, we compute $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a)$, our ‘‘federated’’ (FED) estimator as the weighted average of the site-specific survival estimates:

$$\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \widehat{\eta}_{t,a}^k \widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a).$$

We present the details for implementing the FED estimator in Algorithm 1. Figure 1 further gives an intuitive visualization of the proposed federated algorithm.

2.3.3. THEORETICAL RESULTS OF THE FEDERATED ESTIMATOR

Finally, we establish the pointwise RAL property and the efficiency gain of the federated estimator in Theorem 2.12.

Theorem 2.12. *If the regularity conditions (D.1, D.2 and D.4) specified in Appendix D.2 hold, the federated estimator $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a)$ is pointwise RAL given $t \in [0, \tau]$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$,*

$$\sqrt{n/\widehat{\mathcal{V}}} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

with the variance consistently estimated as $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ (see Appendix D.3). The variance of $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a)$ is no larger than that of the estimator based on the target data only, $\widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a)$. Further,

if there exists some source sites that consistently estimate $\theta^0(t, a)$, and the oracle selection conditions specified in Appendix D.3 are satisfied, the variance of $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a)$ is strictly smaller than $\widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a)$.

3. Numerical Experiments

We conduct extensive simulations to evaluate our ‘‘CCOD’’ and ‘‘FED’’ estimators against competing methods: target-site-only (TGT), simple pooling (POOL), and inverse variance weighting (IVW). TGT uses only target site data ($R = 0$), POOL pools data from all sites without adjustment, and IVW computes a weighted average of site-specific estimators, with weights based on inverse variance. We also consider ‘‘FED (BOOT),’’ as another version of FED, which applies bootstrap (200 replicates) when deriving the federated weights using (1), aiming to reduce uncertainty associated with the estimated influence functions.

3.1. Simulation set-up

We conduct $M = 500$ Monte Carlo replications, with $n = \sum_{k=1}^K n_k$ observations distributed across $K = 5$ sites. Each site $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 4\}$ has n_k observations, with site $k = 0$ as the target site. We fix the target site sample size at $n_0 = 300$ and vary $n_k \in \{300, 600, 1000\}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, 4$, corresponding to limited, moderate, and abundant source data. Covariate, treatment, and outcome generation details are provided in Appendix A.1. The true survival curves are derived by averaging over a super-population of size $n_{\text{super}} = 10^8$ under the target site’s data generation.

We model time-to-event outcomes over one year (365 days), truncating censoring at day 200. Results are evaluated at days 30, 60, and 90. We introduce site-specific heterogeneity across five cases: (i) homogeneous; (ii) covariate shift; (iii) outcome shift; (iv) censoring shift; and (v) all shifts. Case (i) assumes identical processes across sites, while cases (ii)–(iv) introduce site-specific shifts in covariates, conditional outcome, or conditional censoring mechanism. Case (v) combines all three shifts. Figure 4 in Appendix A.1 illustrates the true underlying survival curves under covariate and outcome shifts, providing a direct comparison of these two types of site heterogeneity.

Simulation results are evaluated using: (A) **Estimation Bias**, displayed by boxplots from 500 simulations. Narrower boxes and fewer outliers indicate higher efficiency. (B) **Relative Root Mean Square Error (RRMSE)**, calculated as the ratio of a method’s RMSE to the TGT estimator’s RMSE. RRMSE values below 1 indicates efficiency gains, while values above 1 indicate losses. (C) **95% Confidence Interval (CI) Width**, which represents the size of the estimated variance. (D) **Coverage Probability (CP%)**, defined by the proportion of replications where the true parameter




Figure 1: Illustration of the Federated Algorithm: Each site has its underlying survival functions, which are first estimated site-specifically. The algorithm is then applied over all $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$ (using a finite grid for the time interval in practice) to derive treatment- and time-specific federated weights for the target and source sites, ultimately producing the weighted average survival functions (the purple step).

Algorithm 1 Federated Estimator for Multi-Source Causal Survival Analysis.

- 1: **Input:** Observed multi-source right-censored data $\mathcal{O} = \{(\mathbf{X}_i, A_i, Y_i, \Delta_i, R_i), i = 1, \dots, n\}$, a time horizon $\tau > 0$, and a time grid divided by an $\epsilon > 0$, i.e., $\{0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, \dots, \tau\}$ is a finite and fine grid for interval $[0, \tau]$.
- 2: **Output:** Estimated treatment-specific curves $\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a)$ and variance $\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \hat{\mathcal{V}}(\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a))$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $t \in [0, \tau]$.
- 3: **for** $(t, a) \in \{0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, \dots, \tau\} \times \{0, 1\}$ **do**
- 4: Estimate the EIFs using the DML algorithm with sample-splitting and cross-fitting described in Algorithm 2.
- 5: Obtain the target and source estimators as $\hat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \right]$, for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$.
- 6: Obtain the site-specific discrepancy measure (difference of the target and source estimators) as $\hat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^{k,0} = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^0(\mathcal{O}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \right]$, $k = 1, \dots, K-1$.
- 7: Solve for aggregation treatment- and time-specific weights $\hat{\eta}_{t,a} = (\hat{\eta}_{t,a}^0, \hat{\eta}_{t,a}^1, \dots, \hat{\eta}_{t,a}^{K-1})$ that minimize

$$Q(\eta_{t,a}) = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\left\{ \hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*0}(\mathcal{O}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \eta_{t,a}^k \hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \right\}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{n} \lambda \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} |\eta_{t,a}^k| (\hat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^{k,0})^2,$$

subject to $0 \leq \eta_{t,a}^k \leq 1$, for all $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \eta_{t,a}^k = 1$, and λ is a tuning parameter chosen by cross-validation.

- 8: **end for**
- 9: **Return:**

$$\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \hat{\eta}_{t,a}^k \hat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a), \text{ and } \hat{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{V}(\hat{\eta}_{t,a})^\dagger \text{ for all } (t, a) \in \{0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, \dots, \tau\} \times \{0, 1\}.$$

†: the formula of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ is specified in (9) in Appendix D.3 by replacing the fixed $\eta_{t,a}$ with the estimated value $\hat{\eta}_{t,a}$ here.




Figure 2: Simulation results evaluated at time = day 90, under $n_0 = 300$ and $n_k = 600$ ($k \geq 1$).

falls within the CI. Values close to the nominal 95% level reflect accurate variance estimation.

3.2. Results

For succinctness, we present the simulation results only under day 90 and $n_k = 600$ ($k \geq 1$) in this section. The full simulation results can be found in Appendix A.2. The main results (Figure 2) show that FED and FED (BOOT) consistently exhibit biases centered around zero (panel (A)). Across all site heterogeneity and treatment scenarios, TGT proves the least efficient, while FED and FED (BOOT) achieve a 5%–16% lower RMSE by the RRMSE in panel (B), confirming that our federated methods are consistent with improved efficiency. Furthermore, both federated methods provide 95% CIs that are no wider than TGT’s and produce CP% values near the nominal 95% level. In addition, Figure 5 in Appendix A.2 displays the federated weights across different scenarios. The figure includes a panel showing average weights over time across 500 simulations, as well as a panel with scatterplots of weights versus $(\hat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^k)^2$. These plots reveal that federated weights generally decrease as $(\hat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^k)^2$ increases. The target site often receives higher weights when covariate and outcome shifts are present. These weights can also vary at different time points based on the similarity of survival function values at a given time.

In contrast, although POOL and IVW yield smaller variance (as shown by narrower boxplots and CIs), they are highly biased under Covariate Shift, Outcome Shift, and All Shift scenarios, resulting in elevated RRMSE and severely low CP%. However, these methods remain robust under Censoring Shift, consistent with the notion that censoring is

estimated separately on each site and plays an ancillary role.

Lastly, the CCOD estimator stands out for its robustness and efficiency under Covariate Shift, aligning with its theoretical strengths (consistent, semiparametrically efficient, and accommodating covariate shift). Nonetheless, it can fail under Outcome or All Shifts, because its validity depends on the CCOD assumption.

4. Real Data Analysis

We apply our methods to two coordinated randomized trials, HVTN 704/HPTN 085 and HVTN 703/HPTN 081 (Corey et al., 2021; Ning et al., 2023), which together enrolled 4,611 participants to evaluate whether a broadly neutralizing monoclonal antibody (bnAb) reduces the risk of HIV-1 acquisition. The endpoint was an HIV diagnosis by week 80—a rare event with a 3.77% incidence. The overall rate of loss to follow-up in this study is low (less than 10% in each treatment group), as indicated by Corey et al. (2021).

We divide the data into four subsets by region: (i) SA: South Africa, (ii) OA: other sub-Saharan African countries, (iii) BP: Brazil or Peru, and (iv) US: the United States or Switzerland. Participants in (i) and (ii) were women, whereas those in (iii) and (iv) were cisgender men and transgender individuals, potentially introducing distribution shifts across regions. Because HIV diagnoses were infrequent, we only use a 2-fold cross-fitting, and estimate conditional survival for both event and censoring processes by an ensemble of Kaplan–Meier, Cox regression and survival random forest models via the `survSuperLearner` package (Westling et al., 2023). The propensity score and density ratio (used in federated method) models are fitted by

Targeted Data Fusion for Causal Survival Analysis Under Distribution Shift




Figure 3: **Panel (A):** Age, standardized risk score, and weight are summarized by mean (standard error). **Panel (B):** Thinner, lighter lines depict estimated time-specific federated weights, while bolder lines show smoothed weights using locally weighted regression (Cleveland & Devlin, 1988) to illustrate trend patterns over the study period. **Panel (C):** Missing values at early time points in IVW indicate large IVW weights. Relative efficiency, defined as the ratio of the estimated standard deviation to that of the TGT estimator, is presented for three specific days: 148, 330, and 512.

the ensemble of logistic regression and LASSO from super learner (van der Laan et al., 2007). In all these nuisance models, age (year), a standardized risk score built by machine learning, and weight (kg) at baseline are included as covariates.

In this section, we focus on the SA region as our target site. We include the results of treating other regions as target site (Figure 10) as well as a direct comparison of site-specific curves (Figure 9) in Appendix B. Panel (A) of Figure 3 summarizes baseline covariates and the event by region and treatment group. OA’s summary statistics are similar SA’s, whereas BP and US differ notably in mean standardized risk scores, weight, and HIV prevalence, indicating covariate and possibly outcome shifts compared to SA. This aligns with panel (B) for federated weights over study time, where SA receives the highest weights overall, followed by OA, US, and BP.

Panel (C) shows that the TGT, FED, and FED (BOOT) methods produce similar survival curves. However, TGT sometimes has wider confidence intervals due to lower efficiency and lacks interval estimates at certain early time points when variance estimates are unavailable or too small. In contrast, FED and FED (BOOT) can provide some interval estimates in these cases. The CCOD method generates comparable survival curves with narrower confidence intervals and smaller variances. The efficiency gains observed with FED, FED (BOOT), and CCOD are consistent with our simulation results in Section 3. On the other hand, IVW and POOL methods, while offering more efficient estimates as indicated by lower relative efficiency values, diverge from

the other methods from the trends on their survival curves, suggesting potential bias due to covariate and outcome distribution shifts when targeting the South Africa population.

5. Discussion

In this work, we proposed two methods for estimating treatment-specific survival functions in a target population, leveraging external source data with possibly shifted covariate and outcome distributions. When multi-source data can be pooled and CCOD holds, our CCOD estimator is consistent, semiparametrically efficient, and handles covariate shifts. If CCOD is violated, the federated estimator remains consistent, offers moderate efficiency gains, and preserves data privacy by avoiding individual-level data sharing. This framework is also applicable to settings such as subgroup analysis (Yang et al., 2023) and multi-center clinical trials (Zhuang et al., 2024).

We note several limitations of our work. First, although our simulations show efficiency gains for the federated method, its optimality under data-sharing constraints is not established; exploring efficient covariate-adaptive weighting (Li & Luedtke, 2023) may be a promising future avenue. Second, when data sharing is allowed but CCOD may fail, it is unclear if any method outperforms both target-site-only and federated estimators, as our semiparametric efficiency relies on CCOD. Third, our time-specific federated weights, while flexible, have two drawbacks: (i) they may produce nonsmooth weight estimates over time, and (ii) they are computationally intensive in continuous time when working

on a fine time grid. Therefore, future work should aim to more efficiently capture temporal trends and appropriately smooth these weights.

Our framework can potentially be extended to various settings, including surrogate markers (Gao et al., 2024a; Han et al., 2022), conformal inference (Liu et al.), dynamic treatment regimes (Zhang et al., 2013; Chu et al., 2023), and data-driven individual selection from external sources (Zhu et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024b). It may also apply to direct treatment effect modeling for survival outcomes, such as marginal structural (Yang et al., 2018) and structural nested models (Yang et al., 2020), as well as other survival estimands like restricted mean survival times (Han, 2023; Hua et al., 2024) and truncation contexts (Morenz et al., 2024; Han, 2024; Wang et al., 2024).

References

- Austin, P. C. Generating survival times to simulate cox proportional hazards models with time-varying covariates. *Statistics in medicine*, 31(29):3946–3958, 2012.
- Brantner, C. L., Chang, T.-H., Nguyen, T. Q., Hong, H., Di Stefano, L., and Stuart, E. A. Methods for integrating trials and non-experimental data to examine treatment effect heterogeneity. *Statistical Science*, 38(4):640–654, 2023.
- Cao, Z., Cho, Y., and Li, F. Transporting randomized trial results to estimate counterfactual survival functions in target populations. *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 2024.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 2018.
- Chu, J., Lu, W., and Yang, S. Targeted optimal treatment regime learning using summary statistics. *Biometrika*, 110(4):913–931, 2023.
- Cleveland, W. S. and Devlin, S. J. Locally weighted regression: an approach to regression analysis by local fitting. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 83(403): 596–610, 1988.
- Colnet, B., Mayer, I., Chen, G., Dieng, A., Li, R., Varoquaux, G., Vert, J.-P., Josse, J., and Yang, S. Causal inference methods for combining randomized trials and observational studies: a review. *Statistical science*, 39(1): 165–191, 2024.
- Corey, L., Gilbert, P. B., Juraska, M., Montefiori, D. C., Morris, L., Karuna, S. T., Edupuganti, S., Mgodhi, N. M., Decamp, A. C., Rudnicki, E., et al. Two randomized trials of neutralizing antibodies to prevent hiv-1 acquisition. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 384(11):1003–1014, 2021.
- Cui, Y., Kosorok, M. R., Sverdrup, E., Wager, S., and Zhu, R. Estimating heterogeneous treatment effects with right-censored data via causal survival forests. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(2):179–211, 2023.
- Degtiar, I. and Rose, S. A review of generalizability and transportability. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 10:501–524, 2023.
- Fan, X., Cheng, J., Wang, H., Zhang, B., and Chen, Z. A fast trans-lasso algorithm with penalized weighted score function. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 192: 107899, 2024.
- Gao, C., Gilbert, P. B., and Han, L. On the role of surrogates in conformal inference of individual causal effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.12365*, 2024a.
- Gao, C., Yang, S., Shan, M., YE, W., Lipkovich, I., and Faries, D. Improving randomized controlled trial analysis via data-adaptive borrowing. *Biometrika*, pp. asae069, 2024b.
- Gill, R. D. and Johansen, S. A survey of product-integration with a view toward application in survival analysis. *The annals of statistics*, 18(4):1501–1555, 1990.
- Han, L. Breaking free from the hazard ratio: Embracing the restricted mean survival time in clinical trials, 2023.
- Han, L. Truncated, not forgotten—handling left truncation in time-to-event studies, 2024.
- Han, L., Hou, J., Cho, K., Duan, R., and Cai, T. Federated adaptive causal estimation (face) of target treatment effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09313*, 2021.
- Han, L., Wang, X., and Cai, T. Identifying surrogate markers in real-world comparative effectiveness research. *Statistics in Medicine*, 41(26):5290–5304, 2022.
- Han, L., Shen, Z., and Zubizarreta, J. Multiply robust federated estimation of targeted average treatment effects. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 70453–70482, 2023.
- Han, L., Li, Y., Niknam, B., and Zubizarreta, J. R. Privacy-preserving, communication-efficient, and target-flexible hospital quality measurement. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 18(2):1337–1359, 2024.
- Hernán, M. A. The hazards of hazard ratios. *Epidemiology*, 21(1):13–15, 2010.

- Hua, K., Hong, H., and Wang, X. Inference of treatment effect and its regional modifiers using restricted mean survival time in multi-regional clinical trials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08128*, 2024.
- Lee, D., Yang, S., and Wang, X. Doubly robust estimators for generalizing treatment effects on survival outcomes from randomized controlled trials to a target population. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 10(1):415–440, 2022.
- Li, S. and Luedtke, A. Efficient estimation under data fusion. *Biometrika*, 110(4):1041–1054, 2023.
- Li, S., Cai, T., and Duan, R. Targeting underrepresented populations in precision medicine: A federated transfer learning approach. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 17(4):2970–2992, 2023.
- Liu, Y., Levis, A., Normand, S.-L., and Han, L. Multi-source conformal inference under distribution shift. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Morenz, E. R., Wolock, C. J., and Carone, M. Debiased machine learning for counterfactual survival functionals based on left-truncated right-censored data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09017*, 2024.
- Neyman, J. On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments: Essay on principles. *Statistical Science*, 5:465–480, 1923.
- Ning, X., Pan, Y., Sun, Y., and Gilbert, P. B. A semiparametric cox–aalen transformation model with censored data. *Biometrics*, 79(4):3111–3125, 2023.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- Rubin, D. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66:688–701, 1974.
- Vaart, A. v. d. and Wellner, J. A. Empirical processes. In *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*, pp. 127–384. Springer, 2023.
- Van der Laan, M. J. Statistical inference for variable importance. *The international journal of biostatistics*, 2(1), 2006.
- van der Laan, M. J., Polley, E. C., and Hubbard, A. E. Super learner. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 6(1):1–21, 2007.
- Van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer & Verlag New York, 1996.
- Wang, Y., Ying, A., and Xu, R. Doubly robust estimation under covariate-induced dependent left truncation. *Biometrika*, pp. asae005, 2024.
- Westling, T., van der Laan, M. J., and Carone, M. Correcting an estimator of a multivariate monotone function with isotonic regression. *Electronic journal of statistics*, 14(2): 3032, 2020.
- Westling, T., Luedtke, A., Gilbert, P. B., and Carone, M. Inference for treatment-specific survival curves using machine learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 1–13, 2023.
- Wolock, C. J., Gilbert, P. B., Simon, N., and Carone, M. A framework for leveraging machine learning tools to estimate personalized survival curves. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pp. 1–11, 2024.
- Yang, S. and Ding, P. Combining multiple observational data sources to estimate causal effects. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2019.
- Yang, S., Tsiatis, A. A., and Blazing, M. Modeling survival distribution as a function of time to treatment discontinuation: A dynamic treatment regime approach. *Biometrics*, 74(3):900–909, 2018.
- Yang, S., Pieper, K., and Cools, F. Semiparametric estimation of structural failure time models in continuous-time processes. *Biometrika*, 107(1):123–136, 2020.
- Yang, S., Zhou, R., Li, F., and Thomas, L. E. Propensity score weighting methods for causal subgroup analysis with time-to-event outcomes. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 32(10):1919–1935, 2023.
- Zhang, B., Tsiatis, A. A., Laber, E. B., and Davidian, M. Robust estimation of optimal dynamic treatment regimes for sequential treatment decisions. *Biometrika*, 100(3): 681–694, 2013.
- Zhu, K., Yang, S., and Wang, X. Enhancing statistical validity and power in hybrid controlled trials: A randomization inference approach with conformal selective borrowing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11713*, 2024.
- Zhuang, H., Wang, X., and George, S. L. Assessment of treatment effect heterogeneity for multiregional randomized clinical trials. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, (just-accepted):1–13, 2024.
- Zou, H. The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 101(476):1418–1429, 2006.

A. Additional Details and Results for Numerical Experiments

In this appendix, we present additional details and results for our numerical experiments in Section 3. All experiments in our study were performed using the statistical language R (version 4.4.2).

A.1. Data generating process

Three covariates X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 are sampled as transformations of Beta random variables with site-specific parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\sim 33 \cdot \text{Beta}(1.1 - 0.05\gamma(k), 1.1 + 0.2\gamma(k)) + 9 + 2\gamma(k), \\ X_2 &\sim 52 \cdot \text{Beta}(1.5 + (X_1 + 0.5\gamma(k))/20, 4 + 2\gamma(k)) + 7 + 2\gamma(k), \\ X_3 &\sim (4 + 2\gamma(k)) \cdot \text{Beta}(1.5 + |X_1 - 50 + 3\gamma(k)|/20, 3 + 0.1\gamma(k)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma(k)$ represents some function of site k , specified later. We then generate the treatment assignment probabilities $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ using the logistic function:

$$\text{logit}(\pi(\mathbf{X})) = -1.05 + \log(1.3 + \exp(-12 + X_1/10) + \exp(-2 + X_2/12) + \exp(-2 + X_3/3)),$$

and treatments A are sampled as $A \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi(\mathbf{X}))$.

Next, we consider the mechanisms of event and censoring times. The hazard rates for event times and censoring times are given by the following $\exp(h_t)$ and $\exp(h_c)$, respectively, where $h_t = -5.02 + 0.1(X_1 - 25) - 0.1(X_2 - 25) + 0.05(X_3 - 2) + D_T(k) \cdot 0.1(X_2 - 25) + A \cdot \delta_T(k) \cdot 0.1(X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - 50)$, and $h_c = -4.87 + 0.01(X_1 - 25) - 0.02(X_2 - 25) + 0.01(X_3 - 2) - D_C(k) \cdot 0.1(X_2 - 25) + A \cdot \delta_C(k) \cdot 0.1(X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - 50)$.

Here, $D_T(k)$, $D_C(k)$, $\delta_T(k)$ and $\delta_C(k)$ are some site-specific indicators, specified later, for varying the treatment effects and trends of survival curves for different sites. Then, event times and censoring times are sampled as:

$$T = \left(-\frac{\log(U_1)}{\exp(h_t) \cdot \lambda} \right)^{1/\rho}, \quad C = \left(-\frac{\log(U_2)}{\exp(h_c) \cdot \lambda} \right)^{1/\rho},$$

with $\rho = 1.2$, $\lambda = 0.6$, and $U_1, U_2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$. This technique follows Austin (2012). Thus, the observed times and event indicators are $Y = \min(T, C)$, $\Delta = \mathbb{I}(T \leq C)$, respectively. Under this data generating process (DGP), the event time is generated as a similar way of days in a year (365 days), and we truncate the censoring time at $t = 200$ days to mimic the end of follow-up in survival analysis. Our DGP supports the following scenarios based on site-specific heterogeneity:

- **Homogeneous:** Homogeneous covariates and hazard rates across sites. We let $\gamma(k) = D_T(k) = D_C(k) = \delta_T(k) = \delta_C(k) = 0$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 4$.
- **Covariate Shift:** Covariates X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 vary across sites. We let $\gamma(k) = k$ and $D_T(k) = D_C(k) = \delta_T(k) = \delta_C(k) = 0$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 4$.
- **Outcome Shift:** Conditional outcome distribution varies across sites. We assign $\gamma(k) = 0$, $D_T(k) = \delta_T(k) = k$, and $D_C(k) = \delta_C(k) = 0$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 4$.
- **Censoring Shift:** Censoring mechanism varies across sites. We let $\gamma(k) = 0$, $D_T(k) = \delta_T(k) = 0$ and $D_C(k) = \delta_C(k) = k$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 4$.
- **All Shift:** Covariates and both event and censoring effects vary across sites. We let $\gamma(k) = D_T(k) = D_C(k) = \delta_T(k) = \delta_C(k) = k$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 4$.

Figure 4 plots the true treatment-specific survival curves under the Covariate Shift and Outcome Shift scenarios, as defined by our designed DGPs, to illustrate the effect of site differences on survival outcomes.




Figure 4: True treatment-specific survival curves across different sites. Each curve is derived from a random sample of $n = 10^4$ generated under the site’s own DGP. Dashed lines represent the target site’s survival curves for reference. Under covariate shift, the curves maintain similar shapes and trends, differing primarily in scale. In contrast, outcome shift leads to marked alterations in the shapes of the survival curves.




Figure 5: **Upper panel:** Average federated weights of each site at different time point by site heterogeneity cases. **Lower panel:** scatter plots of site-specific federated weights vs. discrepancy measure $(\hat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^k)^2$ values, under 5 scenarios of site heterogeneity and 3 selected time points (days 30, 60 and 90). Sites 2–4 under Covariate Shift and All Shift have more larger $(\hat{\chi}_{n,t,a}^k)^2$ values with clear trends of decreasing weights. The pink dashed lines indicate weight = 1/5, i.e., one over five sites. This figure uses the case where $n_k = 300$ ($k \geq 1$) as an illustration for weights.

A.2. Complete simulation results




Figure 6: Estimation bias (boxplots), relative root mean square error (RRMSE) compared to TGT, coverage probability (CP%) with 95% nominal coverage level, and width of 95% confidence interval (CI) under $n_k = 300$ ($k \geq 1$), evaluated at days 30, 60 and 90 in simulation.

Targeted Data Fusion for Causal Survival Analysis Under Distribution Shift




Figure 7: Estimation bias (boxplots), relative root mean square error (RRMSE) compared to TGT, coverage probability (CP%) with 95% nominal coverage level, and width of 95% confidence interval (CI) under $n_k = 600$ ($k \geq 1$), evaluated at days 30, 60 and 90 in simulation.

Targeted Data Fusion for Causal Survival Analysis Under Distribution Shift




Figure 8: Estimation bias (boxplots), relative root mean square error (RRMSE) compared to TGT, coverage probability (CP%) with 95% nominal coverage level, and width of 95% confidence interval (CI) under $n_k = 1000$ ($k \geq 1$), evaluated at days 30, 60 and 90 in simulation.

B. Additional Data Analysis Results

In Figure 9, we plot the region-specific survival curves of all the 4 regions we considered (SA, OA, BP and US) for a direct comparison on region heterogeneity, using their target-site-only (TGT) estimators, to showcase the heterogeneous effects of the bnAb antibody treatment on different target populations.





Figure 9: Estimated region-specific survival curves of the HVTN 704/HPTN 085 and HVTN 703/HPTN 081 trials. SA (our target region in the main text) and OA exhibit relatively similar curves, indicating less heterogeneity of these two regions. In contrast, both BP and US regions show significant differences to SA, which also confirms why they often have small or zero federated weights in Panel (C) of Figure 3. The BP and US also show a substantial difference on their curves.

Furthermore, in Figure 10, we present the results—including survival curve estimations and federated weights—using three regions other than SA as the target population. For the federated weights, similar to Figure 3 in the main text, we applied locally weighted regression (Cleveland & Devlin, 1988) to smooth the observed weights over the study period, providing a clearer visualization of temporal trends in this specific example.


From Figure 10, we observe that for each region, the FED and FED (BOOT) methods yield results similar to the TGT estimator, while also recovering some interval estimations at earlier time points. This finding is consistent with the observations made in Figure 3. In contrast, the IVW and POOL methods deviate noticeably from the TGT, FED, and FED (BOOT) results—especially for the BP and US regions—indicating potential biases introduced by site heterogeneity. The CCOD in each region produces curves that more closely align with the corresponding TGT, FED, and FED (BOOT) methods.

Finally, regarding federated weights, the results for the OA region resemble those of SA in Figure 3. However, for the BP and US regions, the federated weights are nearly 1 for the target site and 0 for all other sites. This pattern suggests that when targeting the survival curves of BP or US, other sites contribute substantial biases—an observation that corroborates our findings in Figure 9.

OA (Other Sub-Saharan African Countries)



BP (Brazil or Peru)



US (The United States or Switzerland)




Figure 10: Additional data analysis results when treating the other three regions (OA, BP and US) as the target site.

C. Double/debiased Machine Learning Algorithm for Nuisance Function Predictions

In this section, we detail the procedures for fitting and predicting nuisance functions. Algorithm 2 outlines the DML algorithm employed in Algorithm 1 for federated causal survival estimation. A similar process is applied to the CCOD and other estimators when predicting their respective nuisance functions.

Algorithm 2 Double/debiased machine learning (DML) algorithm for nuisance function estimations and influence function calculations in Algorithm 1 at a given time point and treatment.

- 1: **Input:** Observed multi-source right-censored data $\mathcal{O} = \{\mathcal{O}_i = (\mathbf{X}_i, A_i, Y_i, \Delta_i, R_i), i = 1, \dots, n\} = \mathcal{O}^0 \cup \mathcal{O}^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{O}^{K-1}$, where $R_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ and \mathcal{O}^k represents the data for site $R = k$; Given treatment group $A = a$ and a specific time point t ; The number of disjoint folds into which the data are split, M , where $M \in \{2, 3, \dots, \lfloor n^*/2 \rfloor\}$ with $n^* = \min\{n, n_1, \dots, n_{K-1}\}$.
 - 2: **Output:** Estimated influence functions for each individual.
 - 3: Partition \mathcal{O}^0 into M approximately equal-sized, disjoint validation folds $\mathcal{V}_1^0, \dots, \mathcal{V}_M^0$, allowing a size difference of at most ± 1 between folds.
 - 4: **for** $m = 1, \dots, M$ **do**
 - 5: Define the training set $\mathcal{T}_m^0 = \mathcal{O}^0 \setminus \mathcal{V}_m^0$;
 - 6: Fit nuisance functions S^0, G^0, π^0 on \mathcal{T}_m^0 , using some methods ensemble from `survSuperLearner` and `SuperLearner`;
 - 7: Predict nuisance functions on \mathcal{V}_m^0 as $\widehat{S}_m^0, \widehat{G}_m^0$ and $\widehat{\pi}_m^0$.
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: Train a model of S^0 by the entire data of the target site \mathcal{O}^0 , denoted as $S^{0,\text{full}}$, using chosen methods ensemble from `survSuperLearner`.
 - 10: **for** $k = 1, \dots, K-1$ **do**
 - 11: Partition \mathcal{O}^k into M approximately equal-sized, disjoint validation folds $\mathcal{V}_1^k, \dots, \mathcal{V}_M^k$, allowing a size difference of at most ± 1 between folds.
 - 12: **for** $m = 1, \dots, M$ **do**
 - 13: Define the training set $\mathcal{T}_m^k = \mathcal{O}^k \setminus \mathcal{V}_m^k$;
 - 14: Fit the density ratio $\omega^{k,0}$ using only covariate data of $\mathcal{T}_m^0 \cup \mathcal{T}_m^k$, or by just passing through some coarsening level summary statistics;
 - 15: Fit nuisance functions G^k, π^k on \mathcal{T}_m^k , using chosen methods ensembles from `survSuperLearner` and `SuperLearner`;
 - 16: Predict above nuisance functions on \mathcal{V}_m^k as $\widehat{G}_m^k, \widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}$ and $\widehat{\pi}_m^k$;
 - 17: Predict nuisance function S^k on \mathcal{V}_m^k using the pre-trained $S^{0,\text{full}}$ model, and denote the predicted value by \widehat{S}_m^k .
 - 18: **end for**
 - 19: Aggregate all predicted nuisance functions over M folds as $\widehat{S}^k, \widehat{G}^k, \widehat{\omega}^{k,0}$ and $\widehat{\pi}^k$;
 - 20: **end for**
 - 21: **Return:** The uncentered EIFs of all individuals in \mathcal{O} , by plugging-in their predicted nuisance function values, $\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{S}^k, \widehat{S}^0, \widehat{G}^k, \widehat{\pi}^k, \widehat{\omega}^{k,0})$, and the centered EIFs $\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{S}^k, \widehat{S}^0, \widehat{G}^k, \widehat{\pi}^k, \widehat{\omega}^{k,0})$ by centering the uncentered EIFs to their sample mean, for all $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$.
-

D. Technical Proofs

We adopt the following notation throughout this appendix: (i) \mathbb{P}_∞ denotes a general probability limit, and the nuisance functions under \mathbb{P}_∞ are denoted with subscript ∞ , e.g., S_∞^0 ; (ii) $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ means the corresponding nuisance functions are replaced by their estimates, and $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ may converge to a general limit \mathbb{P}_∞ ; (iii) $\mathbb{P}_n^m[f(\mathcal{O})] = |\mathcal{V}_m|^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} f(\mathcal{O}_i)$ to denote the empirical average on the m th validation set \mathcal{V}_m by cross-fitting, $m = 1, \dots, M$.

D.1. Theory of the CCOD estimator

D.1.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.8

Proof. Recall the estimand $\theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{E}\{S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) | R = 0\} = \mathbb{E}\{\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) | R = 0\}$ under Assumption 2.6. We write $\bar{\Lambda}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t \frac{\bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})}$ where $\bar{N}_\delta(du | a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq t, \Delta = \delta | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$ and $\bar{D}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}(Y \geq t |$

$A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$). Then, by semiparametric theory, we write the equation

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \theta^0(t, a) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \mathbb{E}\{\bar{S}_\epsilon(t | a, \mathbf{X}) | R = 0\} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{[\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a)] \dot{\ell}_{\mathbf{X}|R=0} | R = 0\} + \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{S}_\epsilon(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \Big| R = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$ denotes the distribution of \mathbf{X} induced by \mathbb{P} and $\dot{\ell}_f$ denotes the score function of f . By Gill & Johansen (1990), the mapping $H \mapsto \bar{S}_H(t) := \prod_{(0,t]} \{1 + H(du)\}$ is Hadamard differentiable relative to the supremum norm with derivative $\alpha \mapsto \bar{S}_H(t) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}_H(u-)}{\bar{S}_H(u)} \alpha(du)$ at H . By the chain rule, the integrand in the second term becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \prod_{(0,t]} \{1 - \bar{\Lambda}_\epsilon(du | a, \mathbf{x})\} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} = -\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x})} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{\Lambda}_\epsilon(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0},$$

with

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{\Lambda}_\epsilon(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{N}_{1,\epsilon}(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0}}{\bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})} - \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{R}_\epsilon(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0}}{\bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2} \bar{N}_{1,\epsilon}(du | a, \mathbf{x}).$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{N}_{1,\epsilon}(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(Y \leq u, \Delta = 1 | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \iint \mathbb{I}(y \leq u, \delta = 1) \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \iint \mathbb{I}(y \leq u, \delta = 1) \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) = \int_\delta \mathbb{I}(\delta = 1) \dot{\ell}(u, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(du, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \bar{D}_\epsilon(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(Y \geq u | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \iint \mathbb{I}(y \geq u) \mathbb{P}_\epsilon(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \iint \mathbb{I}(y \geq u) \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, plugging-in the above expressions,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \iint \prod_{(0,t]} \{1 - \bar{\Lambda}_\epsilon(du | a, \mathbf{x})\} \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \iiint -\mathbb{I}(y \leq t, \delta = 1) \frac{\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(y | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(y | \mathbf{x})} \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &\quad + \iiint \mathbb{I}(u \leq t, u \leq y) \frac{\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(u | \mathbf{x})} \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \iiint -\mathbb{I}(y \leq t, \delta = 1) \frac{\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(y | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(y | \mathbf{x})} \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &\quad + \iiint \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \int_0^{t \wedge y} \frac{\bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(u | \mathbf{x})^2} \bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{S}_A(t | \mathbf{X}) \frac{I(A=a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \bar{H}(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) \bar{S}(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) \bar{D}(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(Y, \Delta | A, \mathbf{X}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{H}(t, a, \mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2}.$$

Now, we note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) \bar{S}(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) \bar{D}(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \middle| A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \right] = \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{N}_1(dy | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(y | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(y | a, \mathbf{x})},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\bar{H}(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\} &= \iint^t \mathbb{I}(u \leq y) \frac{\bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2} \mathbb{P}(dy | a, \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \int_0^t \mathbb{P}(Y \geq u | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) \frac{\bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2} \mathbb{P}(dy | a, \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\bar{H}(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) \bar{S}(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) \bar{D}(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \middle| A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \right] = 0$$

almost surely. By properties of score functions and the tower property, the above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \iint_{(0,t]} \mathbb{I}\{1 - \bar{\Lambda}_\epsilon(du | a, \mathbf{x})\} \mu(dx) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \bar{H}(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) \bar{S}(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) \bar{D}(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these results with the facts that $\bar{N}_1(du | a, \mathbf{x}) / \bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{\Lambda}(du | a, \mathbf{x})$ and $\bar{D}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{S}(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{x})$, we can rewrite (2) at the beginning as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \theta^0(t, a) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(R = 0)} [\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a)] \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(R = 0)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{\bar{S}(y | \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge y} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(u | \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \middle| \mathbf{X} \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(R = 0)} [\bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a)] \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{P}(R = 0 | \mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R = 0)} \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{\bar{S}(y | \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge y} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(u | \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, an uncentered EIF of $\theta^0(t, a)$ at \mathbb{P} is found as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \bar{S}, \bar{G}, \bar{\pi}) &= \varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(R = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(R = 0)} \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R = 0)} \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{\bar{S}(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $q^0(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{P}(R = 0 | \mathbf{X})$ is the target site propensity. □

D.1.2. LEMMATA FOR THE CCOD ESTIMATOR

To establish the RAL related results of the CCOD estimator, we first present a number of lemmata in this section. We assume that the corresponding nuisance functions converge to some general limits defined by \mathbb{P}_∞ . We start by expressing

the difference $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}_n[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \widehat{\mathbb{P}})] - \theta^0(t, a) \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} \widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \theta^0(t, a) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] - \theta^0(t, a) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_m} \widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}^m} [\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}_i)] \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}^m} [\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}_i)] \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \mathbb{P}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} (\mathbb{P}_n^m - \mathbb{P}) [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \mathbb{P} [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] \\
 &= \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m^{1/2}}{n} \mathbb{G}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \mathbb{P} [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \theta^0(t, a)]. \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, in the following Lemma D.1, we establish an $L_2(\mathbb{P})$ norm distance (bound) between the estimated IF and the limiting IF in terms of discrepancies on the nuisance parameters, we consider some decompositions.

Lemma D.1. *Under Assumption 2.3 and Condition 2.2, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\eta)$ such that for each m, n, t , and a ,*

$$\mathbb{P}[\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]^2 \leq C(\eta) \sum_{j=1}^6 \bar{A}_{j,n,m,t,a},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{A}_{1,n,m,t,a} &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=0)} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \right]^2, \\
 \bar{A}_{2,n,m,t,a} &= \mathbb{P} [q_m^0(\mathbf{X}) - q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})]^2, \\
 \bar{A}_{3,n,m,t,a} &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{\bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X})} \right]^2, \\
 \bar{A}_{4,n,m,t,a} &= \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{G}_m(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{\bar{G}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2, \\
 \bar{A}_{5,n,m,t,a} &= \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \left| \frac{\widehat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{S}_m(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{\bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first denote

$$\bar{B}(\mathcal{V}_m) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})} \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{\bar{S}(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}(u | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right].$$

Then, we have the following decomposition:

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} = \sum_{j=1}^4 \bar{U}_{j,n,m,t,a},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_{1,n,m,t,a} &= \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=0)} - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \right] \widehat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{x}), \\ \bar{U}_{2,n,m,t,a} &= \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \left[\widehat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{x}) - \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \right], \\ \bar{U}_{3,n,m,t,a} &= \left[\frac{\widehat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=0)} - \frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \right] \widehat{B}_m(\mathcal{V}_m), \\ \bar{U}_{4,n,m,t,a} &= \frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \left[\widehat{B}_m(\mathcal{V}_m) - \bar{B}_\infty(\mathcal{V}_m) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the expression of $\widehat{B}_m(\mathcal{V}_m) - \bar{B}_\infty(\mathcal{V}_m)$ can be found in Lemma 3 of Westling et al. (2023), while we only need to replace corresponding nuisance functions with the global version here, thus the detail is omitted. Then, by the triangle inequality, we have $\mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} \right]^2 \leq \left[\sum_{j=1}^4 \mathbb{P} \{ (\bar{U}_{j,n,m,t,a})^2 \} \right]^{1/2}$. Therefore, under Assumption 2.3 and Condition 2.2, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\eta)$ such that the result in the statement holds. Thus, the proof is completed. \square

Furthermore, we investigate conditions that make the empirical process term $\mathbb{G}_n^m \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} \right]$ to be $o_p(n^{-1/2})$. This requires some preliminaries from the empirical process theory (Vaart & Wellner, 2023). We first introduce the following notation and Lemma D.2. Then, we consider results for uniform convergence over $t \in [0, \tau]$.

Given a class of functions \mathcal{F} on a sample space \mathcal{X} , a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, the covering number $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|)$ is the minimal number of $\|\cdot\|$ -balls of radius ε needed to cover \mathcal{F} . The centers of these balls need not be in \mathcal{F} . An $(\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|)$ bracket is a set of the form $\{f \in \mathcal{F} : l(x) \leq f(x) \leq u(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ such that $\|u - l\| \leq \varepsilon$ and is denoted $[l, u]$. Here l and u need not be elements of \mathcal{F} . The bracketing number $N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|)$ is then defined as the minimal number of $(\varepsilon, \|\cdot\|)$ brackets needed to cover \mathcal{F} . It is well known that $N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|) \leq N_{[]}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|)$. Readers are referred to Vaart & Wellner (2023) for more theory on empirical processes and their applications.

Lemma D.2 (Lemma 4 in Westling et al. (2023)). *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{x \mapsto f_t(x) : t \in [0, \tau]\}$ be a class of functions on a sample space \mathcal{X} such that $f_s(x) \leq f_t(x)$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq \tau$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and such that an envelope F for \mathcal{F} satisfies $\|F\|_{\mathbb{P},2} < \infty$. Then $N_{[]}(\varepsilon \|F\|_{\mathbb{P},2}, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P})) \leq \mathbb{P}(f_\tau - f)^2 / (\varepsilon^2 \|F\|_{\mathbb{P},2}^2) \leq 4\varepsilon^2$ for all $(0, 1]$. If \mathcal{F} is uniformly bounded by a constant C , then $N(\varepsilon C, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 1/\varepsilon^2$ for each probability distribution \mathbb{Q} on \mathcal{X} .*

Then, we introduce the following Lemma D.3. For simplicity, p^0 and q^0 correspond to, respectively, $\mathbb{P}(R=0)$ and $q^0(\mathbf{X})$, and S, π, G correspond to, respectively $\bar{S}, \bar{\pi}$ and \bar{G} functions in Lemma D.3.

Lemma D.3. *Let S, π, q^0, p^0 , and G be fixed, where $t \mapsto S(t | a, \mathbf{x})$ is assumed to be non-increasing for each (a, \mathbf{x}) , and where $S(t_0 | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $G(t_0 | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $\pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, and $p^0 \geq 1/\eta$, for some $\eta \in (0, \infty)$. Then the class of influence functions $\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0} = \{\varphi_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0} : t \in [0, t_0]\}$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon \|F\|_{\mathbb{Q},2}, \mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 32/\varepsilon^{10},$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ where $F = \eta(1 + 2\eta^2)$ is an envelope of $\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}$, and the supremum is taken over all distributions \mathbb{Q} on the sample space of the observed data.

Proof. The class $\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}$ is uniformly bounded by $\eta(1 + 2\eta^2)$ because of the assumed upper bounds of $1/p^0, 1/\pi$ and $1/G$. Therefore, the envelop function can be taken as $F = \eta(1 + 2\eta^2)$.

Define the following two functions f_t and h_t pointwise as

$$f_t(\mathbf{x}, a_0, \delta, y) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(a = a_0, y \leq t, \delta = 1)q^0(\mathbf{x})S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})}{p^0\pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})},$$

$$h_t(\mathbf{x}, a_0, y) = \int \frac{\mathbb{I}(a = a_0, u \leq y, u \leq t)q^0(\mathbf{x})S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})}{p^0\pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})} \Lambda(du | a_0, \mathbf{x}).$$

Consider classes $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,t_0,a_0}^1 = \{(\mathbf{x}, r) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(r = 0)S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})/p^0 : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}^2 = \{(\mathbf{x}, a_0, \delta, y) \mapsto f_t(\mathbf{x}, a_0, \delta, y) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t,a_0}^3 = \{(\mathbf{x}, a_0, y) \mapsto h_t(\mathbf{x}, a_0, y) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$. We can then write

$$\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0} \subseteq \{f_1 - f_2 + f_3 : f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,t_0,a_0}^1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}^2, f_3 \in \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}^3\}.$$

Since $(\mathbf{x}, r) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(r = 0)S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})/p^0$ is non-increasing over $t \in [0, t_0]$ for all (\mathbf{x}, r) and uniformly bounded by $1/\eta$, Lemma D.2 implies that $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,t_0,a_0}^1, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 2\varepsilon^2$.

The $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}^2$ is contained in the product of the classes $\{y \mapsto \mathbb{I}(y \leq t) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, $\{\mathbf{x} \mapsto S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x}) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, and the singleton class $\{(\mathbf{x}, a_0, \delta, y) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(a = a_0, \delta = 1, y \leq t)q^0(\mathbf{x})/[p^0\pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})]\}$. The first two classes both have covering number $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon, \cdot, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ by Lemma D.2. The third class has uniform covering number 1 for all ε because it can be covered with a single ball of any positive radius. In addition, $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t,a_0}^2$ is uniformly bounded by η^3 . Therefore, based on Lemma 5.1 in Van der Laan (2006), $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta^3, \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t,a_0}^2, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 4/\varepsilon^4$.

Furthermore, based on Lemma 5.1 in Van der Laan (2006) again, we can rewrite $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}^3 = \{(\mathbf{x}, a_0, y) \mapsto \int m_t(u, \mathbf{x}, a_0, y)\mu^*(du) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, where

$$m_t(u, \mathbf{x}, a_0, y) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(a = a_0, u \leq y, u \leq t)q^0(\mathbf{x})S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})}{p^0\pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})} \lambda^*(u | a_0, \mathbf{x}),$$

with $\mu^*(du)$ is a dominating measure for \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} and $\lambda^*(du | a_0, \mathbf{x})$ the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\Lambda(\cdot | a_0, \mathbf{x})$ with respect to μ^* . Then, the class $\mathcal{M}_t = \{m_t : t \in [0, t_0]\}$ is contained in the product of the singleton class $\{(\mathbf{x}, a_0, y, u) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(a = a_0, u \leq y)q^0(\mathbf{x})\lambda^*(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})/[p^0\pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})]\}$ and the class $\{u \mapsto \mathbb{I}(u \leq t) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$ and $\{\mathbf{x} \mapsto S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x}) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, which as discussed above both have $L_2(\mathbb{Q})$ covering number bounded by $2/\varepsilon^2$ for any probability measure \mathbb{Q} . Therefore, $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta^3, \mathcal{M}_t, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 4/\varepsilon^4$. By Jensen's inequality, $\|h_t - h_s\|_{L_2(\mathbb{Q})} \leq \|m_t - m_s\|_{L_2(\mu^* \times \mathbb{Q})}$ for any \mathbb{Q} , which implies that $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta^3, \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,q^0,G,t,a_0}^3, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq \sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta^3, \mathcal{M}_t, L_2(\mu^* \times \mathbb{Q})) \leq 4/\varepsilon^4$ for all \mathbb{Q} .

Therefore, we have shown that the three classes have covering numbers bounded by $2/\varepsilon^2$, $4/\varepsilon^4$ and $4/\varepsilon^4$, respectively. Therefore, by Lemma 5.1 in Van der Laan (2006),

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta(1 + 2\eta^2), \mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,p^0,q^0,G,t_0,a_0}, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 32/\varepsilon^{10}.$$

□

Lemma D.4. *If Conditions 2.1–2.2 hold, then $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M n^{-1} M n_m^{1/2} \mathbb{G}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{CCOD} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{CCOD}] = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. If Conditions 2.3 holds as well,*

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m^{1/2}}{n} \sup_{u \in [0,t]} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{CCOD} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{CCOD}]| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. We follow notation in Lemma D.1. First, we note that

$$\frac{M n_m^{1/2}}{n} \leq \frac{M(|n_m - n/M| + n/M)^{1/2}}{n} \leq \frac{M|n_m - n/M|^{1/2} + M|n/M|^{1/2}}{n} \leq \left(\frac{M}{n}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{M}{n},$$

for all m since $|n_m - n/M| \leq 1$ by assumption on n_m . Then, we have that

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m^{1/2}}{n} \sup_{u \in [0,t]} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{CCOD} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{CCOD}]| \leq O(n^{-1/2}) \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sup_{u \in [0,t]} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{CCOD} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{CCOD}]|,$$

since $K = O(1)$.

Therefore, for the pointwise claim, we turn to show $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| = o_p(1)$. Using conditional argument, we write

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| | \mathcal{T}_m],$$

where $\mathcal{T}_m = \mathcal{O} \setminus \mathcal{V}_m$ is the m th training set. Note that the randomness in the inner expectation of the right-hand-side above, by conditioning on the training set, is only induced from \mathbb{G}_n^m by averaging over the observations on the validation set. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| | \mathcal{T}_m] = \mathbb{P} |\mathbb{G}_n^m (\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}})|.$$

Defining $\mathcal{F}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}$ as the singleton class of functions $\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{k,0}$, we further have

$$\mathbb{P} |\mathbb{G}_n^m (\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}})| = \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}} |\mathbb{G}_n^m(f)| \right].$$

By Theorem 2.1.14 in [Van der Vaart & Wellner \(1996\)](#), the covering number of $\mathcal{F}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}$ is 1 for all ε , so the uniform entropy integral $J(1, \mathcal{F}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}})$ is 1 relative to the natural envelope $|\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}|$. Therefore, there is a universal constant C' such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}} |\mathbb{G}_n^m(f)| \right] \leq C' \{\mathbb{P}(\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}})^2\}^{1/2} \leq C'' \sum_{j=1}^6 \bar{A}_{j,n,m,t,a},$$

following definition of $\bar{A}_{j,n,m,t,a}$ terms in [Lemma D.8](#). So we showed that $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]|$ is bounded up to $C''' \sum_{j=1}^6 \mathbb{E}[\max_m(\bar{A}_{j,n,m,t,a})]$ for some constant C''' . It is straightforward that by [Conditions D.1 and D.2](#), this upper bound tends to zero, which implies that $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| = o_p(1)$.

Next, we show the uniform statement. The basic argument is the same. We first write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} |\mathbb{G}_n^m \{\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}\}| \mid \mathcal{T}_m \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a}} |\mathbb{G}_n^m g| \right],$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a} = \{\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} : u \in [0,t]\}$. When conditioning on \mathcal{T}_m , the functions $\hat{S}_m, \hat{G}_m, \hat{\pi}_m$ and \hat{q}_m^0 are fixed, so [Lemma D.3](#) implies that

$$\log \sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon \|\bar{G}_{n,m,t,a}\|_{\mathbb{Q},2}, \mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a}, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq \tilde{C} \log \varepsilon^{-1},$$

for some constant \tilde{C} not depending on n, m , or ε , and where $\bar{G}_{n,m,t,a} := \sup_{u \in [0,t]} |\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}|$ is the natural envelope function for $\mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a}$. As a result, the uniform entropy integral

$$J(1, \mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a}, L_2(\mathbb{P})) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^1 [1 + \log N(\varepsilon \|\bar{G}_{n,m,t,a}\|_{\mathbb{Q},2}, \mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a}, L_2(\mathbb{Q}))]^{1/2} d\varepsilon$$

is bounded by a constant not depending on n or m . By Theorem 2.14.2 of [Van der Vaart & Wellner \(1996\)](#), there is therefore a constant \bar{C} not depending on n or m such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m,t,a}} |\mathbb{G}_n^m g| \right] &\leq \bar{C} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \{\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}) - \varphi_{\infty,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O})\}^2 \right] \\ &\leq \bar{C} C(\eta) \sum_{j=1}^6 \bar{A}_{j,n,m,t,a}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows notation and results of Lemma D.1. We therefore have that

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{\infty,u,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] \right| \right] \leq \bar{C}C(\eta) \sum_{j=1}^6 \max_m \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}_{j,n,m,t,a}].$$

By Assumption 2.3, Conditions 2.1, 2.2, and 2.4, this bound tends to zero. \square

Lemma D.5. Consider some general nuisance functions under \mathbb{P}_∞ , denoted by \bar{S}_∞ , \bar{G}_∞ , $\bar{\pi}_\infty$, and q_∞^0 . Then, $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X}) q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})}{\bar{G}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\bar{\Lambda}_\infty - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right].$$

Proof. We first express $\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)$ as

$$\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X})} H_{\bar{S}_\infty, \bar{G}_\infty, t, a}(Y, \Delta, \mathbf{X}),$$

where

$$H_{\bar{S}_\infty, \bar{G}_\infty, t, a}(Y, \Delta, \mathbf{X}) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{\bar{S}_\infty(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}_\infty(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}_\infty(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{X})}.$$

Following a result in Lemma 1 of Westling et al. (2023), $\mathbb{E}\{H_{\bar{S}_\infty, \bar{G}_\infty, t, a}(Y, \Delta, \mathbf{X}) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\}$ equals

$$- \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{x})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{x}) \bar{G}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{x})} (\bar{\Lambda}_\infty - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{x}).$$

Therefore, it is straightforward that $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \{ \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})}{q^0(\mathbf{X})} \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})}{\bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X})} \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{G}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X})} (\bar{\Lambda}_\infty - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Duhamel equation in Gill & Johansen (1990), we have

$$\bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X}) = -\bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y- | a, \mathbf{X})} (\Lambda_\infty^0 - \Lambda^0)(du | a, \mathbf{X}),$$

for each (t, a, \mathbf{x}) . Therefore, we further have $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \bar{S}_\infty(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X}) q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})}{\bar{G}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\bar{\Lambda}_\infty - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right]. \quad (4)$$

\square

D.1.3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.9

Proof. By the result in equation (3) with $\bar{\pi}_\infty = \bar{\pi}$, $\bar{G}_\infty = \bar{G}$, and $\bar{S}_\infty = \bar{S}$,

$$\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m^{1/2}}{n} \mathbb{G}_n^m [\hat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m}{n} \mathbb{P} [\hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \theta^0(t, a)].$$

By Conditions 2.1 and 2.2, the second summand on the right-hand-side is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Lemma D.4. By Lemma D.5, $\mathbb{P}[\hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\hat{S}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X}) \hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X})}{\hat{G}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\hat{\Lambda}_m - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right].$$

By Duhamel equation in Gill & Johansen (1990), we have that

$$\frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\hat{S}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X})} (\hat{\Lambda}_m - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) = \left(\frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}),$$

and so the above equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X}) \hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X})}{\hat{G}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \left(\frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \left\{ \frac{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})}{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})}{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X})}{\hat{G}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \left(\frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{\{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X}) - \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})\} \{\hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X})\}}{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} \right]}_{I_1} \\ &+ \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})}{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} \hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X})}{\hat{G}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \left(\frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right]}_{I_2}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $I_1 \leq \eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[|\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X}) - \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})| \cdot |\hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X})| \right]$. For I_2 , we further expand it, similarly to the above process, as

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})}{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} \{\hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X}) - q^0(\mathbf{X})\} \{\hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X})\}}_{I_{21}} \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{\frac{\hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X})}{\hat{\pi}_m(a | \mathbf{X})} \hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X})}{\hat{G}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \left(\frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X})}_{I_{22}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we note that $I_{21} \leq \eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[|\hat{q}_m^0(\mathbf{X}) - q^0(\mathbf{X})| \cdot |\hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \bar{S}(t | a, \mathbf{X})| \right]$, and

$$I_{22} \leq \eta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{S}_m(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X})}{\hat{G}_m(y | a, \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \left(\frac{\bar{S}}{\hat{S}_m} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right]$$

by Condition 2.2. Then, by notation in Condition 2.4, $I_1 + I_2 \leq \eta^2 \{\bar{r}_{n,t,a,1} + \bar{r}_{n,t,a,2} + \bar{r}_{n,t,a,3}\}$. Since $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M n^{-1} M n_m \leq 2$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m}{n} \mathbb{P}[\hat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \theta^0(t, a)] \right| \leq 2\eta^2 (1 + \eta) \{\bar{r}_{n,t,a,1} + \bar{r}_{n,t,a,2} + \bar{r}_{n,t,a,3}\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

by Condition 2.4. This established the pointwise RAL property: $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a) = \theta^0(t, a) + \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{t,a}^{*\text{CCOD}}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Since $\varphi_{t,a}^{*\text{CCOD}}$ is uniformly bounded, $\mathbb{P}\{(\varphi_{t,a}^{*\text{CCOD}})^2\} < \infty$ and since $\mathbb{P}\{\varphi_{t,a}^{*\text{CCOD}}\} = 0$, it follows that

$$n^{1/2}\mathbb{P}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*\text{CCOD}}) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{P}\{(\varphi_{t,a}^{*\text{CCOD}})^2\}).$$

For the uniform RAL, we use the same decomposition above. By conditions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4 and Lemma D.4,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m^{1/2}}{n} \sup_{u \in [0, t]} |\mathbb{G}_n^m [\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \varphi_{t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}]| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \mathbb{P}_n^m(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}} - \theta^0(t, a)) \right| \leq \sup_{u \in [0, t]} 2\eta^2 \{\bar{r}_{n,u,a,1} + \bar{r}_{n,u,a,2} + \bar{r}_{n,u,a,3}\},$$

which is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Condition 2.5. Therefore, $\sup_{u \in [0, t]} |\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(u, a) - \theta^0(u, a) - \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{u,a}^{*\text{CCOD}})| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Since $\{\varphi_{u,a}^{*\text{CCOD}} : u \in [0, t]\}$ is a uniformly bounded \mathbb{P} -Donsker class by Lemma D.3, $\{n^{1/2}\mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{u,a}^{*\text{CCOD}}) : u \in [0, t]\}$ converges weakly to a tight mean-zero Gaussian process with covariance $(u, v) \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\varphi_{u,a}^{*\text{CCOD}} \varphi_{v,a}^{*\text{CCOD}})$. \square

Remark D.6 (Double robustness of the CCOD estimator). If we only focus on the consistency of $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a)$, then the condition $\bar{\pi}_\infty = \bar{\pi}$, $\bar{G}_\infty = \bar{G}$, $q_\infty^0 = q^0$ and $\bar{S}_\infty = \bar{S}$ can be replaced by the following statement: For \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} , there exist measurable sets $\bar{S}_x, \bar{G}_x \subseteq [0, t]$ such that $\bar{S}_x \cup \bar{G}_x = [0, t]$ and $\bar{\Lambda}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{\Lambda}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{x})$ for all $u \in \bar{S}_x$ and $\bar{G}(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = \bar{G}_\infty(u | a, \mathbf{x})$ for all $u \in \bar{G}_x$. In addition, if \bar{S}_x is a strict subset of $[0, t]$, then $\bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{x}) = \bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{x})$ and $q_0(\mathbf{x}) = q_\infty^0(\mathbf{x})$ as well. Then, $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a)$ is consistent if Conditions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, and it is uniform consistent if Condition 2.3 also holds.

This statement could be interpreted as that at a given time t , if either (i) the conditional survival model \bar{S} ; or (ii) all other nuisance functions \bar{G} , $\bar{\pi}$ and q^0 are correctly specified (with other conditions above), $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{CCOD}}(t, a)$ is consistent.

The proof details of Remark D.6 are similar to those in the proof of Theorem 2 in Westling et al. (2023), which are omitted here. A sketch is that by decomposing the integral \int_0^t as $\int_{\bar{S}_x} + \int_{\bar{S}_x^c}$, where \bar{S}_x^c is the complement of set \bar{S}_x , and $\bar{S}_x^c \subseteq \bar{G}_x$ by definition. Then it is straightforward to verify that when the statement in Remark D.6 holds, the following integral (also in the bias term (4))

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X}) q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})}{\bar{G}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\bar{\Lambda}_\infty - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \\ &= \left(\int_{\bar{S}_x} + \int_{\bar{G}_x} \right) \frac{\bar{S}(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\bar{S}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\bar{G}(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}(a | \mathbf{X}) q_\infty^0(\mathbf{X})}{\bar{G}_\infty(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \bar{\pi}_\infty(a | \mathbf{X}) q^0(\mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\bar{\Lambda}_\infty - \bar{\Lambda})(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which further implies $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{\text{CCOD}}] - \theta^0(t, a) = 0$. The remainder of proving the consistency or uniform consistency also needs Lemmata D.1–D.3.

D.2. Theory of the source-site estimator

We first prove Theorem 2.10 about the EIF of the source-site estimator in the following Section D.2.1. We then provide proofs for the RAL and uniform RAL properties of the source-site estimator. The techniques employed parallel those used for the CCOD estimator, so some proofs are either omitted or provided with less detail.

D.2.1. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.10

Proof. Under Assumption 2.6, $\theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{E}\{S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) | R = 0\} = \mathbb{E}\{S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) | R = 0\}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \theta^0(t, a) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \mathbb{E}\{S_\epsilon^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) | R = 0\} \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{[S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a)] \dot{\ell}_{\mathbf{X}|R=0} | R = 0\} + \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} S_\epsilon^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \Big| R = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Following a similar argument in the proof of Theorem 2.8 in Section D.1.1, we can express the integrand of the second term above as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \iint_{(0,t]} \mathcal{P} \{1 - \Lambda_\epsilon^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})\} \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\
 &= \iiint -\mathbb{I}(y \leq t, \delta = 1) \frac{S^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(y | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(y | \mathbf{x})} \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\
 & \quad + \iiint \mathbb{I}(u \leq t, u \leq y) \frac{S^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) S^k(u- | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(u | \mathbf{x})} \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\
 &= \iiint -\mathbb{I}(y \leq t, \delta = 1) \frac{S^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(y | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(y | \mathbf{x})} \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\
 & \quad + \iiint S^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \int_0^{t \wedge y} \frac{S^k(u- | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(u | \mathbf{x})^2} N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x}) \dot{\ell}(y, \delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mathbb{P}(dy, d\delta | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[S_A^k(t | \mathbf{X}) \frac{I(A = a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ H^k(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) S^k(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) D^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(Y, \Delta | A, \mathbf{X}, R = k) \right],
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H^k(t, a, \mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t \frac{S^k(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2}.$$

Now, we note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) S^k(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) D^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \Big| A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k \right] = \int_0^t \frac{S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{x}) N_1^k(dy | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(y | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(y | a, \mathbf{x})},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E} \{ H^k(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k \} \\
 &= \int \int^t \mathbb{I}(u \leq y) \frac{S^k(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2} \mathbb{P}(dy | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \\
 &= \int_0^t \mathbb{P}(Y \geq u | A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k) \frac{S^k(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})^2} \mathbb{P}(dy | a, \mathbf{x}, k) \\
 &= \int_0^t \frac{S^k(u- | a, \mathbf{x}) N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) D^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[H^k(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) S^k(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) D^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \Big| A = a, \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, R = k \right] = 0$$

almost surely. By properties of score functions and the tower property, the above implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \iint_{(0,t]} \mathcal{P} \{1 - \Lambda_\epsilon^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})\} \mu(d\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(R = k)}{\mathbb{P}(R = k | \mathbf{X})} \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ H^k(t \wedge Y, A, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1) S^k(Y- | A, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X}) D^k(Y | A, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining these results with the facts that $N_1^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})/D^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = \Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{x})$ and $D^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = S^k(u - | x)G^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})$, we can rewrite (5) at the beginning as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \theta^0(t, a) \Big|_{\epsilon=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} [S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a)] \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})\mathbb{P}(R=k | \mathbf{X})} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta=1)}{S^k(y | \mathbf{X})G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | \mathbf{X})G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \Big| \mathbf{X} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \{S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a)\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k) \mathbb{P}(R=0 | \mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0) \mathbb{P}(R=k | \mathbf{X})} S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta=1)}{S^k(y | \mathbf{X})G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | \mathbf{X})G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\} \dot{\ell}(\mathcal{O}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, an uncentered EIF of $\theta^0(t, a)$ at \mathbb{P} is found as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) &= \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)\mathbb{P}(R=0 | \mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)\mathbb{P}(R=k | \mathbf{X})} S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \\ &\quad \times \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta=1)}{S^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})G^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, by Bayes's rule,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(R=0 | \mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=k | \mathbf{X})} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} | R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} | R=k)} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)},$$

$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X})}$

where $\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X})$ is a density ratio term, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}) &= \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \\ &\quad \times \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta=1)}{S^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})G^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

D.2.2. REGULARITY CONDITIONS AND RAL OF THE SOURCE-SITE ESTIMATOR

For site $R=k$, we denote π^k , G^k , $\omega^{k,0}$, Λ^k and S^k the truths of nuisance functions. We use π_∞^k , $\omega_\infty^{k,0}$, G_∞^k , Λ_∞^k and S_∞^k to denote some general probability limits for the nuisance function estimators.

Condition D.1. *There exist π_∞^k , $\omega_\infty^{k,0}$, G_∞^k , Λ_∞^k and S_∞^k such that*

- (a) $\max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_m^k(a | \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{\pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \right]^2 \rightarrow_p 0$;
- (b) $\max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) - \omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) \right]^2 \rightarrow_p 0$;
- (c) $\max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{G}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{G_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2 \rightarrow_p 0$;
- (d) $\max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{\widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{S}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{S_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2 \rightarrow_p 0$.

Condition D.2. *There exists an $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ such that for \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} , $\widehat{\pi}_m^k(a | \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $\pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, $\widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \eta$, $\omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \eta$, $\widehat{G}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$, and $G_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta$ with probability tending to 1.*

Condition D.3.

$$\max_m \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \sup_{v \in [0, u]} \left| \frac{\widehat{S}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{S}_m^k(v | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{S_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(v | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2 \rightarrow_p 0.$$

Condition D.4. Define

$$\begin{aligned} r_{n,t,a,1}^k &= \max_m \mathbb{P} \left| \{ \widehat{\pi}_m^k(a | \mathbf{X}) - \pi^k(a | \mathbf{X}) \} \{ \widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \} \right|, \\ r_{n,t,a,2}^k &= \max_m \mathbb{P} \left| \{ \widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) - \omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) \} \{ \widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \} \right|, \text{ and} \\ r_{n,t,a,3}^k &= \max_m \mathbb{P} \left| \widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{G}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} \left(\frac{S^k}{\widehat{S}_m^k} - 1 \right) (du | a, \mathbf{X}) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it holds that $r_{n,t,a,1}^k = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, $r_{n,t,a,2}^k = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and $r_{n,t,a,3}^k = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Condition D.5. It holds that $\sup_{u \in [0, t]} r_{n,u,a,1}^k = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, $\sup_{u \in [0, t]} r_{n,u,a,2}^k = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, and $\sup_{u \in [0, t]} r_{n,u,a,3}^k = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

The following theorem formally states the (uniform) RAL of the source-site estimator.

Theorem D.7. If Conditions D.1–D.2 hold, with $\pi_\infty^k = \pi^k$, $\omega_\infty^{k,0} = \omega^{k,0}$, $G_\infty^k = G^k$, and $S_\infty^k = S^k$, the CCOD holds, and Condition D.4 also holds, then $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) = \theta^0(t, a) + \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. In particular, $n^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a))$ then converges in distribution to a normal random variable with mean zero and variance $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{P}[(\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0})^2]$. If Conditions D.3 and D.5 also hold, then

$$\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \widehat{\theta}_n^k(u, a) - \theta^0(u, a) - \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{u,a}^{*k,0}) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

In particular, $\{n^{1/2}(\widehat{\theta}_n^k(u, a) - \theta^0(u, a)) : u \in [0, t]\}$ converges weakly as a process in the space $\ell^\infty([0, t])$ of uniformly bounded functions on $[0, t]$ to a tight mean zero Gaussian process with covariance function $(u, v) \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\varphi_{u,a}^{*k,0} \varphi_{v,a}^{*k,0})$.

To prove Theorem D.7, we first introduce and prove several lemmata in the next section.

D.2.3. LEMMATA FOR THE SOURCE-SITE ESTIMATOR

To establish the RAL related results of $\widehat{\theta}_n^k(t, a)$, we start from considering the difference $\widehat{\theta}_n^k(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a)$. Recall that \mathbb{P}_n^m is the empirical distribution corresponding to the m th validation set \mathcal{V}_m from the entire data \mathcal{O} , and denote \mathbb{G}_n^m the corresponding empirical process. Then, following the similar process used in (3), it can be shown that

$$\widehat{\theta}_n^k(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{*k,0}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m^{1/2}}{n} \mathbb{G}_n^m \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{k,0} \right] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \theta^0(t, a) \right]. \quad (6)$$

Next, similar to what we did for the CCOD estimator, in the following Lemma D.8, we establish the $L_2(\mathbb{P})$ norm distance (bound) between the estimated IF and the limiting IF for the source-site estimator.

Lemma D.8. Under Condition D.2, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\eta)$ such that for each k, m, n, t , and a ,

$$\mathbb{P}[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{k,0}]^2 \leq C(\eta) \sum_{j=1}^6 A_{j,n,m,t,a}^k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{1,n,m,t,a}^k &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=0)} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \right]^2, \\
 A_{2,n,m,t,a}^k &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=k)} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \right]^2, \\
 A_{3,n,m,t,a}^k &= \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(a | \mathbf{X}) - \omega_\infty^{k,0}(a | \mathbf{X}) \right]^2, \\
 A_{4,n,m,t,a}^k &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\widehat{\pi}_m^k(a | \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{\pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \right]^2, \\
 A_{5,n,m,t,a}^k &= \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{G}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{1}{G_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2, \\
 A_{6,n,m,t,a}^k &= \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{u \in [0,t]} \left| \frac{\widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{S}_m^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} - \frac{S_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right| \right]^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first denote

$$\begin{aligned}
 B^k(\mathcal{V}_m) &= \frac{\mathbb{I}(A=a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \Delta = 1)}{S^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right], \\
 C^k(\mathcal{V}_m) &= B^k(\mathcal{V}_m) \omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, we first have the following decomposition:

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{k,0} = \sum_{j=1}^4 U_{j,n,m,t,a}^k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{1,n,m,t,a}^k &= \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=0)} - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \right] \widehat{S}_m^0(t | a, \mathbf{x}), \\
 U_{2,n,m,t,a}^k &= \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \left[\widehat{S}_m^0(t | a, \mathbf{x}) - S_\infty^0(t | a, \mathbf{x}) \right], \\
 U_{3,n,m,t,a}^k &= \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\mathbb{P}_n^m(R=k)} - \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \right] \widehat{C}_m^k(\mathcal{V}_m), \\
 U_{4,n,m,t,a}^k &= \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \left[\widehat{C}_m^k(\mathcal{V}_m) - C_\infty^k(\mathcal{V}_m) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, for $U_{4,n,m,t,a}^k$, we further decompose it as

$$U_{4,n,m,t,a}^k = \frac{\mathbb{I}(R=k)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \sum_{j=1}^2 V_{j,n,m,t,a}^k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_{1,n,m,t,a}^k &= B_\infty^k(\mathcal{V}_m) \left[\widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) - \omega_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) \right], \\
 V_{2,n,m,t,a}^k &= \widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) \left[\widehat{B}_m^k(\mathcal{V}_m) - B_\infty^k(\mathcal{V}_m) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The expression of $\widehat{B}_m^k(\mathcal{V}_m) - B_\infty^k(\mathcal{V}_m)$ is exactly the same as the Lemma 3 in Westling et al. (2023), while we only need to replace the corresponding nuisance functions by the site- k version here, so the detail is omitted. By the triangle inequality, we have $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a}^{k,0}]^2 \leq \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathbb{P}[(U_{j,n,m,t,a}^k)^2]^{1/2} \right\}^2$. Therefore, under Assumption 2.3 and Condition D.2, there exists a universal constant $C = C(\eta)$ such that the result in the statement holds. Thus, the proof is completed. \square

Furthermore, we investigate how to make the empirical process term $\mathbb{G}_n^m \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a_0}^{k,0} \right]$ to be $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ to establish the asymptotic normality. We first recall Lemma D.2 in Section D.1.2 and related empirical process notation there. Then, we introduce the following Lemma D.9. For simplicity, ω, p^0 and p^k correspond to, respectively, $\omega^{k,0}, \mathbb{P}(R=0), \mathbb{P}(R=k)$, and since $S^0 = S^k$ is assumed, we just use S to denote conditional survival of the event time for all k , and without loss of generality, $G = G^k$ and $\pi = \pi^k$ are also dependent to $R = k$.

Lemma D.9. *Let S, π, ω, p^0, p^k and G be fixed, where $t \mapsto S(t | a, \mathbf{x})$ is assumed to be non-increasing for each (a, \mathbf{x}) , and where $S(t_0 | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta, G(t_0 | a, \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta, \pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x}) \geq 1/\eta, \omega(\mathbf{x}) \leq \eta, p^0 \geq 1/\eta$ and $p^k \geq 1/\eta$, for some $\eta \in (0, \infty)$. Then the class of influence functions $\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,\omega,p^0,p^k,G,t_0,a_0} = \{\varphi_{S,\pi,\omega,p^0,p^k,G,t_0,a_0} : t \in [0, t_0]\}$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon \|F\|_{\mathbb{Q},2}, \mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,\omega,p^0,p^k,G,t_0,a_0}, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 32/\varepsilon^{10},$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ where $F = \eta(1 + 2\eta^3)$ is an envelope of $\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,\omega,p^0,p^k,G,t_0,a_0}$, and the supremum is taken over all distributions \mathbb{Q} on the sample space of the observed data.

Proof. The class $\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,\omega,p^0,p^k,G,t_0,a_0}$ is uniformly bounded by $\eta(1 + 2\eta^3)$ because of the assumed upper bounds of $1/p^0, 1/p^k, \omega, 1/\pi$ and $1/G$. Therefore, the envelop function can be taken as $F = \eta(1 + 2\eta^3)$.

Define the following two functions f_t and h_t pointwise as

$$f_t(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, \delta, y) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(r = k, a = a_0, y \leq t, \delta = 1)\omega(\mathbf{x})S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})}{p^k \pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})},$$

$$h_t(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y) = \int \frac{\mathbb{I}(r = k, a = a_0, u \leq y, u \leq t)\omega(\mathbf{x})S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})}{p^k \pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})} \Lambda(du | a_0, \mathbf{x}).$$

Consider classes $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,t_0,a_0}^1 = \{(\mathbf{x}, r) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(r = 0)S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})/p^0 : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^2 = \{(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, \delta, y) \mapsto f_t(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, \delta, y) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^3 = \{(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y) \mapsto h_t(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$. We can then write

$$\mathcal{F}_{S,\pi,\omega,p^0,p^k,G,t_0,a_0} \subseteq \{f_1 - f_2 + f_3 : f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,t_0,a_0}^1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^2, f_3 \in \mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^3\}.$$

Since $(\mathbf{x}, r) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(r = 0)S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})/p^0$ is non-increasing for all (\mathbf{x}, r) and uniformly bounded by $1/\eta$, Lemma D.2 implies that $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{S,p^0,t_0,a_0}^1, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 2\varepsilon^2$.

The $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^2$ is contained in the product of the classes $\{y \mapsto \mathbb{I}(y \leq t) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, $\{\mathbf{x} \mapsto S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x}) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, and the singleton class $\{(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, \delta, y) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(r = k, a = a_0, \delta = 1, y \leq t)\omega(\mathbf{x})/[p^k \pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(y | a_0, \mathbf{x})]\}$. The first two classes both have covering number $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon, \cdot, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ by Lemma D.2. The third class has uniform covering number 1 for all ε because it can be covered with a single ball of any positive radius. In addition, $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^2$ is uniformly bounded by η^4 . Therefore, $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta^4, \mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^2, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 4/\varepsilon^4$.

Furthermore, similar to the proof of Lemma D.3, we can rewrite $\mathcal{F}_{S,p^k,\omega,G,t_0,a_0}^3 = \{(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y) \mapsto \int m_t(u, \mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y) \mu^*(du) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, where

$$m_t(u, \mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y) = \frac{\mathbb{I}(r = k, a = a_0, u \leq y, u \leq t)\omega(\mathbf{x})S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x})}{p^k \pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})} \lambda^*(u | a_0, \mathbf{x}),$$

with $\mu^*(du)$ is a dominating measure for \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} and $\lambda^*(du | a_0, \mathbf{x})$ the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\Lambda(\cdot | a_0, \mathbf{x})$ with respect to μ^* . Then, the class $\mathcal{M}_t = \{m_t : t \in [0, t_0]\}$ is contained in the product of the singleton class $\{(\mathbf{x}, r, a_0, y, u) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(r = k, a = a_0, u \leq y)\omega(\mathbf{x})\lambda^*(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})/[p^k \pi(a_0 | \mathbf{x})S(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})G(u | a_0, \mathbf{x})]\}$ and the class $\{u \mapsto \mathbb{I}(u \leq t) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$ and $\{\mathbf{x} \mapsto S(t | a_0, \mathbf{x}) : t \in [0, t_0]\}$, which as discussed above both have $L_2(\mathbb{Q})$ covering number bounded by $2/\varepsilon^2$ for any probability measure \mathbb{Q} . Therefore, $\sup_{\mathbb{Q}} N(\varepsilon\eta^4, \mathcal{M}_t, L_2(\mathbb{Q})) \leq 4/\varepsilon^4$. The remainder of the proof is the same as that of Lemma D.3 (except for replacing η^3 by η^4 here). \square

Lemma D.10. *If Conditions D.1–D.2 hold, then $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M n^{-1} M n_m^{1/2} \mathbb{G}_n^m \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a_0}^{k,0} \right] = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. If Conditions D.3 holds as well,*

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m^{1/2}}{n} \sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \mathbb{G}_n^m \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{\infty,t,a_0}^{k,0} \right] \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

The proof of Lemma D.10 is similar to the proof of Lemma D.4, thus it is omitted.

Lemma D.11. Consider some general nuisance functions under \mathbb{P}_∞ , denoted by $S_\infty^0, S_\infty^k, G_\infty^k, \pi_\infty^k$, and $\omega_\infty^{k,0}$ (equals 1 if $k = 0$). Then, $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} S_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})}{\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) G_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\Lambda_\infty^k - \Lambda^k)(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right].$$

Proof. Following the first steps in the proof of Lemma D.5, we can show $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \{S_\infty^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X})\} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^k(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)} \omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) S_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})}{\pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \int_0^t \frac{S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) G_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} (\Lambda_\infty^k - \Lambda^k)(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \{S_\infty^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X})\} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \frac{\omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{X})}{\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X})} S_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})}{\pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \int_0^t \frac{S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) G_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} (\Lambda_\infty^k - \Lambda^k)(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the second “ \mathbb{E} ” after “=”, we used the following relationship:

$$\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{q^k(\mathbf{X})} = \omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{P}(R=0)}{\mathbb{P}(R=k)}$$

by Bayes’s rule. Furthermore, by Duhamel equation in Gill & Johansen (1990) used in Lemma D.5 again, $\mathbb{P}[\varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{P}_\infty)] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} S_\infty^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{S_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})}{\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) G_\infty^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\Lambda_\infty^k - \Lambda^k)(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right]. \quad (7)$$

□

D.2.4. PROOF OF THEOREM D.7

Proof. By (6) with $\pi_\infty^k = \pi^k, \omega_\infty^{k,0} = \omega^{k,0}, G_\infty^k = G^k$, and $S_\infty^k = S^k$,

$$\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) = \mathbb{P}_n[\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m^{1/2}}{n} \mathbb{G}_n^m \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{t,a}^{k,0} \right] + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m}{n} \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \theta^0(t, a) \right].$$

By Conditions D.1 and D.2, the second summand on the right-hand-side is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Lemma D.10. By Lemma D.11, $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0}] - \theta^0(t, a)$ equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q^0(\mathbf{X})}{\mathbb{P}(R=0)} \widehat{S}_m^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \int_0^t \frac{S^k(y- | a, \mathbf{X})}{\widehat{S}_m^k(y | a, \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\widehat{\omega}_m^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) G^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})}{\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) \widehat{G}_m^k(y | a, \mathbf{X}) \widehat{\pi}_m^k(a | \mathbf{X})} - 1 \right\} (\widehat{\Lambda}_m^k - \Lambda^k)(dy | a, \mathbf{X}) \right].$$

By a similar decomposition in the proof of Theorem 2.9 in Section D.1.3 using Duhamel equation in Gill & Johansen (1990), and by notation in Condition D.4, we find that the above bias term can be bounded by $\eta^2 \{r_{n,t,a,1}^k + r_{n,t,a,2}^k + r_{n,t,a,3}^k\}$ over m . Since $M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^M n^{-1} M n_m \leq 2$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{M n_m}{n} \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \theta^0(t, a) \right] \right| \leq 2\eta^2 \{r_{n,t,a,1}^k + r_{n,t,a,2}^k + r_{n,t,a,3}^k\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

by Condition D.4. This established the pointwise RAL property: $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) = \theta^0(t, a) + \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Since $\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}$ is uniformly bounded, $\mathbb{P}\{(\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0})^2\} < \infty$ and since $\mathbb{P}\{\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0}\} = 0$, it follows that

$$n^{1/2} \mathbb{P}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{*k,0}) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{P}\{(\varphi_{t,a}^{*k,0})^2\}).$$

For the uniform RAL, by conditions D.1, D.2 and D.4 and Lemma D.10,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m^{1/2}}{n} \sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \mathbb{G}_n^m(\widehat{\varphi}_{t,a}^{k,0} - \varphi_{t,a}^{k,0}) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{Mn_m}{n} \mathbb{P}_n^m(\widehat{\varphi}_{n,m,t,a}^{k,0} - \theta^0(t, a)) \right| \leq \sup_{u \in [0, t]} 2\eta^2 \{r_{n,t,a,1}^k + r_{n,t,a,2}^k + r_{n,t,a,3}^k\},$$

which is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Condition D.5. Therefore, $\sup_{u \in [0, t]} \left| \widehat{\theta}_n^k(u, a) - \theta^0(u, a) - \mathbb{P}_n(\varphi_{u,a}^{*k,0}) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Since $\{\varphi_{u,a}^{*k,0} : u \in [0, t]\}$ is a uniformly bounded \mathbb{P} -Donsker class by Lemma D.9, $\{n^{1/2} \mathbb{P}_n \{\varphi_{u,a}^{*k,0}\} : u \in [0, t]\}$ converges weakly to a tight mean-zero Gaussian process with covariance $(u, v) \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\varphi_{u,a}^{*k,0} \varphi_{v,a}^{*k,0})$. \square

Remark D.12 (Double robustness of the source-site estimator). If we only need the consistency of $\widehat{\theta}_n^k(t, a)$, then condition $\pi_\infty^k = \pi^k$, $\omega_\infty^{k,0} = \omega^{k,0}$, $G_\infty^k = G^k$, and $S_\infty^k = S^k$ can be replaced by the following statement: For \mathbb{P} -almost all \mathbf{x} , there exist measurable sets $\mathcal{S}_x^k, \mathcal{G}_x^k \subseteq [0, t]$ such that $\mathcal{S}_x^k \cup \mathcal{G}_x^k = [0, t]$ and $\Lambda^k(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = \Lambda_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})$ for all $u \in \mathcal{S}_x^k$ and $G(u | a, \mathbf{x}) = G_\infty^k(u | a, \mathbf{x})$ for all $u \in \mathcal{G}_x^k$. In addition, if \mathcal{S}_x^k is a strict subset of $[0, t]$, then $\pi^k(a | \mathbf{x}) = \pi_\infty^k(a | \mathbf{x})$ and $\omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{x}) = \omega_\infty^{k,0}(\mathbf{x})$ as well. Then, $\widehat{\theta}_n^k(t, a)$ is consistent if Conditions D.1 and D.2 hold, and it is uniform consistent if Condition D.3 also holds. This statement could be interpreted as that at a given time t , if either (i) the conditional survival model S^k ; or (ii) all other nuisance functions G^k , π^k and $\omega^{k,0}$ are correctly specified (with other conditions above), $\widehat{\theta}_n^k(t, a)$ is consistent.

The proof sketch of Remark D.12 is similar to that under Remark D.6 via examining the bias term (7), which is omitted here.

D.3. Theory for the federated estimator

In this section, we present the theoretical properties of the federated estimator. Given that our proposed weights, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}$, are both time- and treatment-specific, we focus on the pointwise convergence properties of the federated estimator.

Let the set of all source site indices be $\mathcal{S} = 1, \dots, K-1$. We define the oracle selection space for $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}$ as:

$$\mathcal{S}_{t,a}^* = \{k \in \mathcal{S} : \theta^k(t, a) = \theta^0(t, a)\}, \quad \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}_{t,a}^*} = \{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a} \in \mathbb{R}^{K-1} : \eta_{t,a}^j = 0, \forall j \notin \mathcal{S}_{t,a}^*\}.$$

This space is both time- and treatment-varying, indicating that a source site may not consistently be useful or unhelpful across different time points or treatments. However, it offers the advantage of increased flexibility and adaptivity, allowing for more effective borrowing of information at different points along the survival functions. Based on the theory presented in Section D.2, for $k \in \mathcal{S}_{t,a}^*$, the site-specific estimator $\widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a)$ is consistent for $\theta^0(t, a)$ for any given $t \in [0, \tau]$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$.

We begin by assuming fixed $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a} = (\eta_{t,a}^0, \eta_{t,a}^1, \dots, \eta_{t,a}^{K-1})$. We invoke Lemmata 4 and 5 in Han et al. (2021), which state that the proposed adaptive estimation for $\eta_{t,a}^k$ as shown in (1) allows for (i) the recovery of the optimal $\eta_{t,a}^k$ by the estimator $\widehat{\eta}_{t,a}^k$, and (ii) the uncertainty induced by $\widehat{\eta}_{t,a}^k$ is negligible when estimating $\theta^0(t, a)$. We require regularity Conditions D.1, D.2 and D.4 for the pointwise convergence result in Theorem D.7 hold. Let us denote the federated estimator by plugging-in the fixed $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}$ as

$$\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}) = \left(1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right) \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k \widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a).$$

Let us write

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}) &= S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\pi^0(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \delta = 1)}{S^0(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) G^0(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^0(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^0(u | a, \mathbf{X}) G^0(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\}, \\ \xi^{k,0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}) &= \omega^{k,0}(\mathbf{X}) S^k(t | a, \mathbf{X}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(A = a)}{\pi^k(a | \mathbf{X})} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{I}(Y \leq t, \delta = 1)}{S^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(Y | a, \mathbf{X})} - \int_0^{t \wedge Y} \frac{\Lambda^k(du | a, \mathbf{X})}{S^k(u | a, \mathbf{X}) G^k(u | a, \mathbf{X})} \right\}, \\ \xi^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}) &= S^0(t | a, \mathbf{X}) - \theta^0(t, a), \end{aligned}$$

and $n_k = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = k)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K - 1$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}) - \theta^0(t, a) &= \left(1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right) \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^{k,0}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} \\
 &= \left(1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right) \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \left\{ \widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \widehat{\xi}^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i) \right\} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \eta_{t,a}^k \widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = k) \eta_{t,a}^k \widehat{\xi}^{k,0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i) \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right) \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \widehat{\xi}^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = 0)} \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k \right) \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = 0)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = k) \eta_{t,a}^k \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{k,0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = k)}. \quad (8)
 \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a})$ equals the variance of the influence function of (8). Let us denote it as $\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a})$. Under the assumption of i.i.d. participants within each site, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}) &= \left(1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right)^2 \frac{\mathbb{V}\{\xi^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \xi^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i) \mid R_i = 0\}}{\mathbb{P}(R_i = 0)} \\
 &\quad + \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right)^2 \frac{\mathbb{V}\{\xi^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) \mid R_i = 0\}}{\mathbb{P}(R_i = 0)} \\
 &\quad + 2 \left(1 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right) \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} \eta_{t,a}^k\right) \frac{\text{Cov}\{\xi^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \xi^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i), \xi^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) \mid R_i = 0\}}{\mathbb{P}(R_i = 0)} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}} (\eta_{t,a}^k)^2 \frac{\mathbb{V}\{\xi^{k,0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i) \mid R_i = k\}}{\mathbb{P}(R_i = k)}. \quad (9)
 \end{aligned}$$

With appropriate boundedness conditions on variance and covariance of the influence functions, this variance is finite. Consequently, the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a})$ is expressed as

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a})).$$

We further define the optimal adaptive weights $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a}$ as follows:

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a} = \arg \min_{\eta_{t,a}^k = 0, \forall k \notin \mathcal{S}_{t,a}^*} \mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}). \quad (10)$$

By leveraging Lemmata 4 and 5 from Han et al. (2021), we can recover the optimal weights $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a}$ with negligible uncertainty for estimating $\theta^0(t, a)$ if we estimate $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}$ using (1), akin to adaptive Lasso (Zou, 2006; Fan et al., 2024). The consistency of $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a})$ follows when we can effectively approximate $\mathcal{V}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a})$ with $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a})$. Thus,

$$\sqrt{n/\widehat{\mathcal{V}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a})} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

We now proceed to analyze the efficiency gain resulting from the federation process. The estimator relies only on the target data is denoted as $\widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a) = \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}^0)$, where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t,a}^0$ assigns all weights to the target and none to the source. In contrast, the estimator that leverages the proposed adaptive ensemble approach is denoted as $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a})$. Here $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a}$ can recover the optimal weights $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{t,a}$ that are associated with the minimum asymptotic variance. Consequently, the variance of

$\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \widehat{\eta}_{t,a})$ is no larger than that of the estimator relying solely on the target data since $\eta_{t,a}^0$ is generally not the variance minimizer.

To establish that the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \widehat{\eta}_{t,a})$ is strictly smaller than that of the estimator based solely on the target data $\widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a)$, we adopt Proposition 1 in Han et al. (2021) with a modified informative source condition (modified Assumption 3(b) in Han et al. (2021)).

Specifically, for each source site $s \in \mathcal{S}_{t,a}^*$, we define $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \eta_{t,a}^s)$ a federated estimator where $\eta_{t,a}^s$ is the optimal ensemble weight of site s if we only consider target site and this source site s for the federation. Then, the modified informative source condition is $\left| \text{Cov} \left[\sqrt{n} \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a), \sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \eta_{t,a}^s) - \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a) \right\} \right] \right| \geq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, where $\widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \eta_{t,a}^s) - \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a)$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \eta_{t,a}^s) - \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a) &= \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^{\text{fed}}(t, a; \eta_{t,a}^s) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} - \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_n^0(t, a) - \theta^0(t, a) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) (1 - \eta_{t,a}^s) \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \widehat{\xi}^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = 0)} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \eta_{t,a}^s \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = 0)} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = s) \eta_{t,a}^s \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{s,0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = s)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{0,(2)}(\mathcal{O}_i) - \widehat{\xi}^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = 0)} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = 0) \eta_{t,a}^s \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = 0)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}(R_i = s) \eta_{t,a}^s \frac{\widehat{\xi}^{s,0,(1)}(\mathcal{O}_i)}{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(R_i = s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is straightforward to see that the modified condition can be achieved if $\eta_{t,a}^s > 0$.